

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 8 No. 72

PRESS

17th October 1928

CORRESPONDENCE

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX. — Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 66, Schliesstach 213, Vienna IX. Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

SIXTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

(FULL REPORT.)

Thirty-second Session.

Moscow, 16th August 1928 (Morning).

Questions of the Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies.

Chairman: Comrade KUUSINEN:

As Comrade Humbert-Droz has to report on all the important events in the countries of Latin America, he asks to

be given an hour. This is adopted unanimously. I call on Comrade Humbert-Droz to address the Congress.

Questions of the Latin-American Countries.

Co-Report of Comrade HUMBERT-DROZ.

In the course of the past years, and especially during last year, the relations between the Executive of the C. I. and the South American Communist movement developed considerably owing to the development of the South American movement itself. The Sections of the Communist International in Latin America have considerably developed. With the exception of the Argentine Party which underwent several serious crises, the other sections of the C. I. have considerably extended their influence over the masses. For instance, the Mexican Party increased its membership tenfold in the course of last year; the Brazilian Party succeeded in the course of a few months of legal existence in becoming a mass Party; it has extended its influence over big sections of workers and is leading the trade union movement of Brazil. We have witnessed the development of the Communist movement in several new countries: formation of Communist Parties in Cuba and Paraguay, collective adherence to the Communist International of the Socialist Party of Ecuador which has 10,000 members, affiliation to the Com-

munist International of the Socialist revolutionary Party of Colombia established at a Congress of all the labour organisations of Colombia, which groups around itself collectively the entire trade union movement of that country.

The two latter parties cannot be considered by us as Bolshevised Communist Parties either from the ideological or the organisational viewpoint. Nevertheless these are mass movements which lead the working class and the peasantry in the revolutionary movement; in regard to spontaneity and revolutionary elan, their orientation is certainly towards the Communist International as the only revolutionary international force. At the close of this Congress we will consider the manner of keeping up relations with these Parties which want to affiliate to the C. I. and which are prepared to introduce into their structure and internal life the necessary modifications before becoming real members of the Communist International.

Comrades, this development of our Communist movement in Latin America is to a great extent determined by the de-

velopment of the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants and of big sections of the petty bourgeoisie in Latin America. The process of the colonisation of Latin America by yankee imperialism which developed very rapidly in the last years, has called forth throughout Latin America an anti-imperialist movement of workers, peasants and petty bourgeois elements, a movement which is assuming considerable proportions and revolutionary forms of struggle against imperialism. At the same time the struggle of the peasant masses, the landless peasants and the agricultural labourers against the regime of the big landlords, the regime of military or personal dictatorship which is the predominating political regime in most of the republics of Latin America, has developed into a revolutionary mass movement which found vent in insurrections of peasants, Indians, etc.

Finally, Latin America is also considered by us as one of the most important strategical points of the entire international situation. The rivalry between British and Yankee imperialism which goes on on an international scale, is particularly sharp in the struggle for hegemony in Latin America. We will presently see how since the end of the world war Yankee imperialism is driving out British imperialism methodically and rapidly from the positions it occupied. Consequently, from the viewpoint of the international situation, the role played by Latin America is gaining in importance. But also because Latin America is becoming the principal colonial sphere of Yankee imperialism, the most powerful imperialism, because at present its forces of development are the biggest in the world, the revolutionary movement which is developing in Latin America against colonisation by Yankee imperialism is becoming one of the most important revolutionary factors of the international Socialist revolution, and especially of the struggle against the most powerful of all imperialists.

Comrades, I would like to place before you some problems of the revolutionary and the Communist movement in Latin America. We have there a number of countries with diverse economic and political conditions. If we consider the position of the French and British colonies of the Antilles, Guianas and the small republics of Central America which are essentially agrarian countries without any industrial proletariat, entirely under the domination of Yankee imperialism, if we compare these countries with the economic and political situation in Argentine, Chili and Brazil, we will immediately notice a considerable difference in regard to the economic development, the political regime and the dependence or degree of colonisation of these various countries. The problems with which I will deal here will have to be examined from different viewpoints in accordance with the political and economic conditions of the countries.

However, all these countries so diverse at first sight, including the countries in the South of the South American Continent which are better developed economically and industrially than the countries in the North of that Continent and in Central America (not excepting even Mexico which has already gone through a first stage of revolutionary development against imperialism and the big landlords), have traits in common which we are going to examine so as to lay down the general tactical lines of our Communist action and of revolutionary action in general in Latin America.

First of all, a very important preliminary question. In discussion with comrades from the various Latin American countries, we have at first rather lively controversies concerning the semi-colonial character of Latin America.

As a rule, when we tell our Latin American comrades, on meeting them the first time, that the situation of their country is that of a semi-colony and that consequently we must consider the problems concerning it from the viewpoint of our colonial or semi-colonial tactic, they are indignant at this notion and assert that their country is independent, that it is represented in the League of Nations, has its own diplomats, consulates, etc. I remember the difficulties we had with the representative of the Communist Party of Cuba, one of the most typical colonies of Yankee imperialism. For a long time this comrade would not agree with us that Cuba is a semi-colony of Yankee imperialism. I therefore, think that it will be useful to demonstrate this semi-colonial character of the Latin-American countries.

Some Latin American countries seem to enjoy considerable independence: Argentine, Uruguay, Chili. Compared with other Latin America countries, there are considerable differences in the economic structure of these countries, in their political regime and the degree of civilisation. However, the investment of British and American capital in Argentine, Chili and Brazil, countries with a certain industrial development, show us that their economic development is not independent, that it is not the development of a capitalist economy independent of imperialism from which it will be able to emancipate itself at any moment; but that these countries are — certainly to a lesser degree, — semi-colonies of British and Yankee imperialism. It is also self-evident that in the countries where the struggle between British and Yankee imperialism for economic hegemony and political influence on the government is still undecided, where the forces of these two imperialisms are equal, as this is the case in Chili and Argentine, this very rivalry of the imperialisms allows the governments of these countries greater freedom of movement and manoeuvring. If we eliminate the Antilles and Central American countries which have remained colonies of various European countries, and consider the characteristics of the other "free" countries of Latin America, we realise that they have one thing in common: all of them are former Spanish or Portuguese colonies which emancipated themselves during the independence wars of the last century, but which having thrown off the tutelage of Spain and Portugal, became gradually the prey of British and subsequently also of Yankee imperialism. Their "emancipation" gave them political "independence". In Latin America there are no concessions as in China, nor capitulations as in Turkey, nor any external form of the domination of British or Yankee imperialism. From the formal and juridical viewpoint, the countries of Latin America are "independent". It should, however, be pointed out that these independence wars of the peoples of South America against Spain and Portugal were not a struggle of the natives against the colonisation effected by the Spanish and Portuguese conquerors. I will explain what I mean: The Portuguese and Spanish Conquerors drove the Indian tribes into the interior of the Continent, they took away the land from the Indians who lived under a primitive Communist regime, and divided it into big latifundia which are in the hands of white landed proprietors. The struggle against Spain and Portugal was not a struggle of the Indians against the Spanish and Portuguese conquerors for the restitution of their land, it was an independent struggle of the descendants of the settlers and big landed proprietors to emancipate themselves from the yoke and tributes imposed by the mother countries. They kept the land of the Indians, continued to despoil them and developed not into a national bourgeoisie but into a class of big national landed proprietors.

Soon after Latin America secured its political independence it became an important sphere of exploitation of the various European imperialists, the British first and foremost. On the eve of the world war the investments of British imperialism in Latin America amounted to 5000 million dollars. Lagging far behind British imperialism came the United States with one thousand two hundred and fifty million dollars, that is to say, with a capital four times smaller than that invested by British imperialism. France and Germany also endeavoured to invest capital and conquer the South American market, to extend their economic influence. It is not necessary to dwell here on this truth which everyone knows that the countries of Latin America are rich in raw material: oil, metals of all kinds, nitrates in Chili and that they are also rich from the viewpoint of agriculture and industrial crops: rubber, cotton, cocoa, coffee, grain, meat, etc. Exploitation of the soil and the mineral wealth was the bait for the various imperialisms, and especially the British imperialism.

Moreover, Latin America is a big continent with a relatively small population; therefore, it is also a colonial domain, capable of absorbing the labour power of immigrants.

I have said that prior to the world war hegemony in this colonisation of Latin America was in the hands of Great Britain. If we compare the figures of 1914 with those of 1928 we immediately realise how much the situation has changed and to what extent the colonisation of Latin America by the United States is developing.

In 1928 capital invested by Great Britain amounts to £ 1,200,000; it increased by 15 to 20% since 1914; the capital invested by the United States in Latin America amounts also to about £ 1,200,000. Thus, it increased in the course of the same years by 300%.

This fact shows that one cannot consider the colonisation of Latin America only from the viewpoint of the capital invested there, because if we study the figures we see that the capital invested by Great Britain is still slightly bigger than that invested by Yankee capitalists. But if we consider the tendency of the development, the rapidity with which investment of capital is proceeding in Latin America, we notice immediately that the recent excessive development in this direction favours yankee imperialism.

A few figures will demonstrate the rapidity and importance of this conquest of Latin America by the finance capital of North America. If we compare the figures of 1912 with those of 1928, we arrive at the following increase of Yankee capital:

Argentine	1025%
Brazil	676%
Chili	2906%
Peru	82%
Venezuela	5309%
Colombia	6000%

The two countries which have been to all intents and purposes conquered by American finance capital in the course of the last years are Venezuela and Colombia, that is to say, the countries richest in oil where exploitation of the oil wells has particularly developed in the last years. The figures for Colombia are given on the basis of loans and investments of capital made up to the first months of 1928. Since the publication of these figures the Colombian government was given an opportunity to get another loan of 100 million dollars which will raise the comparative figure from 6 to 10,000%.

I have said that Latin America is becoming a big colony of Yankee imperialism. In regard to this I draw your attention to the fact that the investment of Yankee capital in Latin America exceeds the capital invested by Yankee imperialism in Europe and constitutes 40% of the entire capital invested by the United States throughout the world.

This conquest of America by American finance capital is not proceeding evenly. The struggle of the North American capital against British hegemony, its advance proceeds geographically and methodically from the North to the South of the Continent. The "free" islands of the Antilles, Cuba, Haiti, St. Domingo are already colonies, all the republics of Central America — if we eliminate Mexico which has special conditions — are in reality the possession of big American companies which exploit the agricultural labourers and landless peasants.

I have already mentioned the investment of capital in Venezuela and Colombia where Yankee influence reigns supreme. But the more we go to the South of the Continent, the more we find the influence of British capital and struggle between British and North American finance capital. In Peru Yankee capital has already secured supremacy and has compelled certain British companies which were paramount, for instance, in the exploitation of copper, to form mixed Anglo-American companies. With regard to the nitrate mines of Chili the same phenomenon is to be observed. A big struggle is carried on in Argentina and Brazil where the hegemony of British capital still prevails.

We must, however, point out that the Ibanez dictatorship in Chili and the victory of the Irrigoyenist Party at the time of the last elections in Argentina, are a sign of the growing influence of Yankee imperialism on the governments of the country, parallel with increased investment of capital which pursues the obvious aim of securing as rapidly as possible hegemony in the whole continent.

Naturally, investment of capital alone is not enough to demonstrate the semi-colonial character of Latin American. One must also point out certain other phenomena which accompany this investment. For instance the growing commercial interchange between the countries of Latin America

and the United States. The latter secured in the course of the last years first place in regard to import of manufactured articles into Latin America. At the end of the war the United States were responsible only for 40% of the imports, whereas today they are responsible for 66%, which means that two-thirds of the products imported into Latin America come from the United States, this in spite of the efforts made by Germany, Japan and Italy to develop their commercial outlets into Latin America. This growing economic control develops also on the political field. The United States is using every possible method of corruption and coercion to secure political control over the States of Latin America, and to guarantee thereby the security of the invested capital. The countries of Central America are already entirely under the political control of the United States. The Constitution of Cuba provides for the right of the United States to intervene in the internal affairs of Cuba in case of unrest, so as to maintain "law and order". If the peoples of Central America do not nominate the candidates of Wall Street during presidential elections — which are engineered by the subsidies of the United States — brutai American intervention takes place immediately. The military intervention in Nicaragua, the elections carried out under the control of the American navy demonstrate the manner in which the United States intervenes whenever its influence is merely contested.

There exists an official protectorate of the United States over Panama, Haiti, St. Domingo, etc. In other Latin American countries, Ecuador, for instance, where American investments are comparatively small, United States experts are invited to intervene under the pretext of helping these countries to put their finances and their rate of exchange right, to organise the service of their foreign debt, etc. The Konierev mission worked in Colombia, Ecuador and Chile and while putting in order the finances and the whole economic and financial life of these countries, it appoints American agents as controllers of customs, banks, financial institutions. Of course this is done in proper form. In Ecuador, for instance, North American experts are appointed by the Government, and when we said to our Ecuador comrades that these controllers were agents of Yankee imperialism, they endeavoured to demonstrate to us that they are appointed by the Ecuador Government which is "at liberty" to accept or reject their advice. Surely, we cannot take seriously this "freedom" of the Ecuador or Colombia Government in regard to the "advice" of the North-American experts who supervise and control customs, financial institutions and banks in their countries. This is one of the forms used by Yankee imperialism to secure political influence on the Governments of the countries of Latin America, and at the same time, to obtain for Yankee commerce and enterprises advantages by the diminution of custom dues on North-American produce, by the suspension of labour-protection laws where they exist, in Yankee enterprises and by the suspension of laws concerning nationalisation of mineral wealth, etc.

Some comrades express the opinion that in its efforts to penetrate into Latin America Yankee imperialism supports the liberal movements against the dictatorship of the big landed proprietors. On the strength of the fact that in Brazil, Argentine and partly also in Chili, the Conservative and reactionary big landed proprietors were allied to British imperialism and that the budding national industrial bourgeoisie, the liberal petty-bourgeoisie, etc., was supported by Yankee imperialism in their movements against the reactionary government, the general rule has been deducted that when penetrating into Latin-America Yankee imperialism favours liberal and even revolutionary movements against the conservatives and the reactionary forms of their government.

I think that this is a wrong notion. For its economic penetration and political domination, the United States makes use of any form of Government. Where the Government and the ruling class are allied with British imperialism, Yankee imperialism supports in the interest of its struggle against British imperialism even revolutionary movements. We had, for instance, revolutionary movements in Sao-Paole in Brazil in which the industrial bourgeoisie, the petty-bourgeoisie, and big sections of workers and peasants of the Sao-Paolo region participated. These movements were clearly supported by Yankee imperialism against the big agrarians then in power who represent the influence of British imperialism. But when we turn our attention to the Republics of Central America, Cuba,

Venezuela, Colombia and Peru, we notice that Yankee imperialism is ruling these countries through the intermediary of the worst reaction. The support given by Yankee imperialism in certain countries of Latin America to certain liberal groups, by no means signifies the desire to support liberal petty-bourgeois movements against the conservatives and the dictatorship of the big agrarians, — it is only a means of struggle against British imperialism where it rules through the intermediary of big landed proprietors.

Another method of Yankee political penetration is all that is grouped around **Pan-Americanism**. You know that the United States is endeavouring to develop relations with Latin America, not only economic, but also political and cultural relations, by means of all sorts of Pan-American associations whose seat is generally New York. Politically, among the states of the American Continent, this Pan-Americanism has assumed the form of a Pan-American Union which unites into one federation and into regular conferences the representatives of all the countries of Latin America under the leadership of the North-American imperialism.

The last conference of the **Pan-American Union** held in **Havana**, was opened by **Coolidge** himself. This conference dealt with a series of problems concerning political and economic relations between the countries of Latin-America and the United States.

It is from the same viewpoint that we must consider the establishment of the **Pan-American Confederation of Labour** (C. O. F. A.) which is endeavouring to co-ordinate the trade union movement of Latin-America and that of the United States into one big Pan-American Trade Union Federation.

The United States, by exporting their capital to Latin America, and developing the industrialisation of the countries of Latin America, develop there at the same time the proletariat, the force which will destroy imperialism and its influence in Latin America. Therefore, Yankee imperialism endeavours to export not only its capital, but also the reformist method of corruption of the American Federation of Labour through the intermediary of the C. O. P. A. which is only the tool of Yankee imperialism in the ranks of the working class, the means by which the Wall Street financiers endeavour to insure their profits against the rebellion of the exploited.

This is one of the colonisation methods of Yankee imperialism in the South-American Continent. It is true that the danger of success in this domain is not very considerable because the working class of Latin-America has realised the real aim of the C. O. P. A. to which not a single mass organisation is affiliated except the C. R. O. M. (Mexican Trade Union Federation).

A few more words on the **economic structure** of the countries of Latin-America because their semi-colonial character is also due to their economic structure. Yankee capital is also invested in Germany and Italy, in highly developed capitalist countries which do not become semi-colonies by this fact. There is no well-developed national capitalism in the countries of Latin-America; the enterprises in which Yankee capital is invested are not exploited with a considerable participation of national capital as in Germany and Italy; there is no well-developed national capitalist regime in Latin-America. Yankee capital is invested in enterprises which are entirely in the hands of foreign imperialism which has created them. The economic structure is essentially agrarian. Nearly all the countries, perhaps with the exception of Chile which is highly industrialised and does not possess much arable land, are countries where agricultural production predominates. And in this agricultural production predominates the regime of big estates which belong either directly to foreign, British, American or Japanese companies — the Japanese secured big concessions in Brazil lately — or to the class of national big landed proprietors who are generally descendants of the Portuguese and Spanish conquerors who took away the land from the Indian tribes.

The political domination of imperialism over the countries of Latin-America is effected through the intermediary of the class of big landed proprietors which is the ruling class.

I have already said that the colonisation forms of Latin-America are not the same as in the other colonial countries. There is no Viceroy or Governor of the United States, although the Yankee Ambassador frequently plays the role of a real Governor of the countries of Latin America, at least in Central America.

Industry is relatively not very much developed, and wherever it has achieved a certain development, it owes it to foreign capital. Countries such as Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, Brazil and Argentine are developing rapidly from the industrial viewpoint and the investment of Yankee capital contributes considerably to this development of the productive forces of Latin-America.

But this development takes place in a certain direction and within certain limits: exploitation of raw material, preparation of mineral products for export, extraction of oil and various metals; it also takes place in the industry which transforms the raw material of agriculture: sugar refineries, tanneries, refrigerators in Argentine, Uruguay, Paraguay, etc. A certain development takes place also in the light industry, textile works, boot factories, etc., for immediate use on the internal market. But there is no development, or very slow and manifestly impeded development in the heavy industry, engineering works. The Yankee and British imperialists who invest capital in Latin-America reserve to themselves the South-American market as an outlet for the manufactured products of their heavy industry. Therefore, when considering the problem of the colonisation and industrialisation of Latin-America, we can assert that the industrialisation is proceeding rapidly and parallel with the colonisation. I emphasise this fact which shows clearly the difference between Latin America and that which Comrade **Kuusinen** told us about **India**. In Latin-America one cannot say that imperialism arrests or impedes the industrial development of the various countries into which it penetrates. On the contrary, the investment of capital contributes to the development of industrialisation, which does not mean that this industrialisation makes Latin-America evolve towards de-colonisation.

On the contrary, the more capital imperialism invests in Latin-America, the more it develops industrialisation, the more also develops the colonisation of Latin-America. As industrialisation is effected directly by imperialism, it has not developed a class of independent national capitalists, consequently it merely accentuates the colonisation of these countries. This shows that wherever the capitalist regime is developing in these countries it does not develop as an independent regime, by its own forces which would jeopardize the imperialist positions, but that this development brings with it an increased colonisation of these countries. That is why the development of the budding national-bourgeoisie in Argentine and Brazil where we have an embryo of a national-bourgeoisie, depends on the investment of foreign capital. This bourgeoisie is tied from its very first steps, to foreign imperialism just as the class of big landed proprietors. This explains the inability of the national bourgeoisie in Latin-America to play a revolutionary role in the struggle against imperialism, — it is tied to the interests of imperialism. Moreover, in many cases the national industrial bourgeoisie is tied to the interests of the landed proprietors. While in Argentine and Brazil the national industrial bourgeoisie has no close ties with the class of landed proprietors, in a number of other countries industrialists are at the same time big landed proprietors: they own works for the transformation of agricultural raw material: sugar refineries on the cane-sugar plantations, etc. Therefore, in most Latin-American countries there is no struggle of the national bourgeoisie against big landed proprietors owing to the very fact that by its social composition this national bourgeoisie is part and parcel of the class of landed proprietors.

On the basis of this economic structure, the **class structure** is as follows: first, the mass of poor peasants and agricultural labourers who work under semi-feudal conditions which resemble more primitive slavery than the modern wage system. The emancipation of the slaves which took place in the course of the last century has changed the juridical position of agricultural labourers on plantations in regard to their former masters, but not their extremely hard labour conditions.

The **Indian tribes** play also a very important role in the social structure of the Latin-American countries, especially in the Bolivian countries, **Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Bolivia**, where the natives who have been driven into the interior of the country are continually rising in order to get back their land.

However, this problem of the struggle of the Indians against the whites is in reality the struggle of the peasants and agricultural labourers against the big landed proprietors.

The working class is relatively weak owing to the relatively weak development of industry. But as industrialisation gradually develops, the class-consciousness, cohesion, the forces and the politico-social role of the working class, of the industrial proletariat also develop.

The mass of the petty-bourgeoisie, intellectuals, artisans, small traders, etc., jeopardized by the penetration of imperialism, play an important social and political role, especially where the proletariat is still weak.

Another important question is that of the character of the revolutionary movements in Latin America. On the basis of the economic and social situation of the countries of Latin America which I have just described, in the course of the last years a revolutionary struggle has developed among the peasant masses (agricultural labourers and poor peasants) against the big landed proprietors, a struggle in which Indians have taken an active part. Parallel with this we witnessed the development of the struggle of the other sections of the population: workers, peasants and the petty-bourgeoisie against the colonisation and exploitation of Latin-America by imperialism.

I will merely enumerate the main facts:

The Mexican Revolution about which our Mexican comrades will speak in greater detail, was an insurrection of landless peasants against the regime of the big landed proprietors, for better conditions of labour. Supported by big sections of workers and the petty-bourgeoisie of Mexico, it led to the establishment of a government of the revolutionary petty-bourgeoisie which has the support and protection of the peasantry and the workers against any attempts at counter-revolution. Struggle against Yankee imperialism has become one of the main features of this revolutionary movement. This revolution which is essentially of an agrarian character has been developing since 1910—11 until to-day, its culminating point being reached in 1917 when the revolutionary Constitution was adopted, a constitution which stipulates nationalisation of the underground wealth, abolition of the rights of the big landed proprietors, introduction of comprehensive social legislation, etc. However, the Mexican Revolution has not given land to the landless peasants and agricultural labourers. The policy of the revolutionary government of Mexico consisted in developing an agrarian bourgeoisie; but this aim has not been fully accomplished because the government did not have the necessary means for this. The struggle of the peasants for land, the counter-revolutionary insurrections provoked by the church and the big landed proprietors together with Yankee imperialism, continue. Civil war is permanent and another revolutionary wave of the masses is imminent.

A movement of a different nature is developing in Ecuador, where, under the influence of the peasant insurrections, the army accomplished in 1925 a coup d'etat which brought the army officers into power. After issuing a decree giving land to the peasants, this government too showed itself unable to bring about an agrarian revolution. It did not expropriate the big landed proprietors, which led to further insurrections of peasants and Indians against the government. The agrarian revolution is still to be made.

In 1923, a similar coup d'etat occurred in Chile which for a time brought a section of the army officers into power. This government which had the support of the labour organisations, the Red trade unions and the Communist Party was overthrown by the bourgeoisie and the landed proprietors and replaced, after another coup d'etat, by the Ibanez dictatorship.

In Nicaragua we witness the insurrection of the liberal general Sandino. Moreover, there is a series of revolutionary movements of the peasants, the petty bourgeoisie and the proletariat where it already plays an important role — in Brazil (Sao Paulo), Argentine (Patagonia), Peru and Bolivia; there have also been demonstrations of workers and students, a general strike and mutinies in Venezuela, an anti-imperialist revolutionary movement in Cuba, the Antilles, in the whole of Central America, etc.

What is the character of these revolutionary movements? First of all there is the revolutionary peasant movement against the big landed proprietors for land; this is in fact the fundamental character of all the revolutionary movements of Latin America. Then there is the struggle of the workers, peasants and the petty-bourgeoisie against imperialism, especially against Yankee imperialism. Then there is the struggle of the working masses against the dictatorship regime, emergency laws and terrorism which is carried on in many of the South

American countries, for civil liberties and a liberal regime. Finally, there is the struggle — wherever the working class is already playing an active role — of the workers for better conditions of labour, for the abolition of conditions reminiscent of slavery on plantations, in mines, etc. Owing to this fundamental character of the revolutionary movement of Latin America we can say that it is a revolutionary movement of the democratic-bourgeois type in a semi-colonial country where struggle against imperialism occupies an important place and where the predominating struggle is not that of a national bourgeoisie for independence on a capitalist basis but struggle of the peasants for the agrarian revolution against the regime of the big landed proprietors.

As to the character of the revolutionary movement in Latin America, we had certain divergences of opinion in our ranks, in the Latin Secretariat and in the Presidium of the C. I. Comrade Travin especially defended the point of view that the revolutionary movement of Mexico and of Latin America in general is a revolutionary movement of an elementary proletarian or Socialist type. He has changed somewhat this first formula in the thesis which he issued on this subject for the Congress. He says in this new thesis: "It is a mistake to look upon these movements as Socialist movements...", then he adds: "it is not a revolution of a democratic-bourgeois type", and he gives certain reasons for this. But lower down he says: "We can define it as a spontaneous mass revolution of a Socialist type..." He also makes the following statement: "As the revolution develops, socialist traits relegate to a back seat bourgeois-democratic traits."

There are a good many contradictions in these assertions. If the Socialist traits of the revolution relegate to a back seat the traits of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, this means that the latter occupied first place. Of what type is then the revolution if it is neither Socialist nor bourgeois-democratic? It seems that according to Comrade Travin's theory there is a certain evolution of the revolution, that it began by being bourgeois-democratic and that it is evolving into a Socialist Revolution by developing the Socialist sector to the detriment of the capitalist. — "Socialist traits relegate to a back seat bourgeois-democratic traits". I think that this is not correct. We have witnessed a peasant revolution against the big landed proprietors for land and against the Diaz military dictatorship in Mexico; for the democratic regime, against Yankee imperialism and the power of the church. We have here the characteristic traits of a bourgeois-democratic revolution.

Is this revolution on the point of evolving gradually towards a Socialist revolution? I think that the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a proletarian revolution does not proceed through the gradual elimination of the bourgeois-democratic character of the revolution and its substitution by the Socialist character. We witness a crisis in the bourgeois-democratic revolution itself. The revolutionary bourgeois democratic government in the hands of the petty-bourgeoisie supported by the agrarian bourgeoisie and a few big landed proprietors who have joined it, arrests the agrarian revolution instead of developing it. Lately, the Calles Government has been making enormous concessions to Yankee imperialism, especially in regard to the application of the laws on oil. The conflict between Mexico and the Yankee oil magnates has been settled by the capitulation of the Mexican Government. The attitude of the Government of Mexico at the Havana Conference was that of capitulation before Yankee imperialism. The struggle of the Mexican Government is not against imperialism but against the working class. It suppresses all strikes, especially in Yankee enterprises. It has capitulated in regard to oil, it is also capitulating before the big landed proprietors. The tribunals are returning to them the confiscated land; there has been no distribution of land among poor peasants and agricultural labourers. The government is endeavouring to disarm the peasants and its struggle is only directed against the church and its attempts at counter-revolutionary insurrection.

The Mexican revolution, instead of evolving gradually towards its Socialist stage, is retrogressing. This retrogression calls forth naturally new internal contradictions, a reaction on the part of the masses. We will not have a gradual evolution of the revolution, a progressive elimination of the bourgeois-democratic traits by Socialist traits, but another crisis of the revolutionary movement. The bourgeois-democratic revolution,

which has not attained all its objects, continues the struggle against the Catholic church and a section of the big landed proprietors. But it does not fulfil the elementary demands of the peasants, it is compromising with imperialism at the expense of the masses; consequently it revives the revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants, which means development of the revolution towards its ultimate aim. The revolutionary struggle will be directed more and more against that section of the petty bourgeoisie which is on the point of going over to the counter-revolutionary camp by its abdication policy. The prospect of the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Mexico is not progressive transformation into Socialist revolution, the prospect is that the hegemony of the petty bourgeoisie in the revolutionary movement of Mexico will be gradually eliminated and that the role of the Communist Party, of the proletariat will become a very important role, that of leader of the masses in the second wave of the revolutionary movement. The bourgeois democratic revolution of Mexico, instead of being led by the petty bourgeoisie, will be led more and more, after the failure of the petty bourgeoisie in power, by the proletariat, by the Party of the proletariat — the Communist Party.

If Comrade Travin means that from the viewpoint of its international role, the Mexican revolution and the revolutionary movement of Latin America are supporting the revolutionary movement of the international proletariat, I fully agree with him. However, it will not become an integral part of it until the revolution in Latin America will have assumed the character of a Socialist revolution; for the time being, it is a revolutionary movement which is not of a Socialist character, but which, as all revolutionary movements in colonial and semi-colonial countries, supports the revolutionary action of the international proletariat and the Socialist world revolution.

If Comrade Travin means that the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Latin America will rapidly develop into a proletarian revolution, I fully agree with him. In these countries there is no base for the development of an independent national capitalism. The capitalist stage of the economic development of Latin America depends entirely on imperialism. The capitalist regime is only developing as a colonial regime. Consequently, struggle against the colonial regime and against the big landed proprietors does not tend to develop an independent capitalist regime in Latin America, this struggle being directed as much against the budding national bourgeoisie allied with imperialism as against imperialism itself. In Latin America we have all the elements for a rapid transition of the bourgeois-democratic revolution to the proletarian revolution.

If Comrade Travin means that in its Socialist stage the revolution will have to accomplish certain tasks which the bourgeois-democratic revolution will not have been able to bring to an end, especially the struggle against imperialism and transference of the land to the peasantry, I again thoroughly agree with him. The bourgeois-democratic revolution will not fully attain its aims (distribution of land to the peasantry, liberation from imperialism) until it develops into a Socialist Revolution under the hegemony of the proletariat. The very history of the Mexican Revolution shows that the petty-bourgeoisie in power, at the head of the revolution, is not able to attain all the aims of the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

Thus, the main question confronting our Parties and ourselves is that of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary movement of Latin America. As long as the revolutionary movement of Latin America remains under the political leadership of the petty bourgeoisie, it will not be able to attain all the aims of the bourgeois-democratic revolution; consistent struggle against imperialism, confiscation of the estates of the big landed proprietors, distribution of land to the peasantry. Thus, the main thing for our Parties at the present juncture is — conquest by their work, propaganda and struggle of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary struggle of the countries of Latin America. I must say that in regard to this there are many shortcomings in our Parties. For instance, the Mexican Party was right in supporting the government in its armed struggle against the insurrections of the big landed proprietors and the church and against the intrigues of Yankee imperialism. But the manner in which our Party supported the Mexican Government was frequently erroneous because our Party did not consider the question of proletarian hegemony, of the conquest of the masses which were defending the revolutionary petty-bourgeois government against the big landed pro-

prietors, the necessity of bringing them under the influence of the Communist Party. By considering too much the Mexican Revolution as a revolution of a Socialist type, as the Russian Revolution, it gave unconditional support to the petty-bourgeois government without endeavouring in the course of the common action to organise the masses in organisations fit to defend the gains of the revolution, as the C. I. had recommended.

The most important question before our Parties is formation of a bloc of the revolutionary forces, a bloc of the agrarian and industrial working class, of the landless peasantry — including even settlers, farmers, etc., — and of the revolutionary petty bourgeoisie. This bloc of all the revolutionary forces is necessary, but in this bloc the Communist Party must maintain its independence, it must make full use of its right to criticise, it must endeavour to get away the masses from the influence of petty bourgeois politicians in order to bring them under the influence of the Communist Party and place them in the service of the revolution. Owing to the hegemony of one class or another in the revolutionary movement of Latin America, the character of this movement and its development possibilities will change completely. The revolutionary movement of Latin America under the leadership of the petty-bourgeoisie proceeds in the form of military coups d'etat supported by the toilers and the army. Generals play a preponderating role, they establish their dictatorship and endeavour to impede the revolutionary action of the masses. Under the hegemony of the working class the action of the masses will occupy first place and will be supported by a section of the army. The relations of the action of the masses and the army will be reversed. That is why our Parties must bring forward at the moment of the development of the revolutionary action the question of the formation of representative organs of the working class, committees of action of workers and peasants, committees for the defence of the revolution, peasant, workers' and soldiers' Soviets, so as to prevent the revolution developing on the lines on which these revolutions were made in the last years, in the form of dictatorship of generals, of the army over the working class and the peasantry: the mass of the workers and peasants must develop dual power in the revolutionary movement by creating their own fighting organs capable of transforming themselves into organs of power of the workers and peasants. I think that this idea has not been given sufficient prominence, especially by our Mexican Party. In the struggle of the Mexican peasants against the big landed proprietors and the church, our Party should have brought up the question of the organisation by the peasants of their own organs of defence and action, the embryo of the peasant regime in the rural districts.

This change in the character of the revolutionary movement is not only linked up with the question of proletarian hegemony, hegemony itself depends to a great extent on the correlation of social forces in countries of Latin America, on the degree of the development, concentration and organisation of the proletariat as an independent class. Industrialisation develops the numerical strength and concentration of the proletariat. It is incumbent on our parties to organise it in the class organisations, to awaken its class consciousness and train it to play in the development of the social and political life the role of leader of the other working classes.

What must be the aims of the revolutionary movement at that stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Latin America? What must be at the same time the main slogans of our work and mass struggle?

1. Expropriation without compensation and nationalisation of land and mineral wealth. Distribution of land among those who till it: for its collective exploitation by agricultural communes, on big plantations, on latifundia and in agricultural communes where collective tilling already exists. Distribution of the land for usufruct to peasants, farmers and settlers where tilling is carried on under the regime of individual or family labour.
2. Confiscation and nationalisation of foreign enterprises (mines, industrial enterprises, transport, banks, etc.).
3. Annulment of State and municipal debts and of all forms of control over the country by imperialism.
4. Eight-hour day and abolition of semi-slave conditions of labour.
5. Arming of workers and peasants and transformation of the army into a workers' and peasants' militia.

6. Abolition of the power of the big landed proprietors and the church, and organisation of the power of workers', peasants' and soldiers' soviets.

It is also necessary to organise the entire revolutionary struggle of Latin America against Yankee imperialism. We must overcome the nationalism which imperialism has fostered in most of the Latin-American countries so as to excite them against each other and divide them. For this purpose we must issue the slogan "Federal Union of the Workers' and Peasants' Republics of Latin America", for their common struggle against Yankee imperialism.

I think that we must lay stress on the necessity of developing against Pan-Americanism which is the instrument of subjection of Latin America by the North American imperialism, the idea of Latin-Americanism. On this subject the representatives of the Communist Parties of the Latin American countries have their doubts in regard to the slogan "Latin Americanism" because it is also the slogan of the petty-bourgeoisie which wants to play a revolutionary role against Yankee imperialism. I think that this slogan is correct even if the petty bourgeoisie is already struggling with this slogan against imperialism: rallying the entire trade union movement of Latin America into one trade union federation, and the same for the peasant organisations; rallying the entire anti-imperialist movement on a Latin-American basis to demonstrate the solidarity of the countries of Latin America. There is nothing in the race or language which separates the peoples of Latin America into different nationalities. United Latin America must constitute a whole directed against Yankee imperialism. Our addition to the slogan of the petty bourgeoisie is alliance of all the revolutionary forces of Latin America with the revolutionary working class of the United States which must support their struggle.

On this subject, we must say that our Party in the United States has not done its duty towards Cuba, Mexico and Nicaragua which it should have supported more effectively.

The last question raised by the Parties of Latin America is that of the formation of workers' and peasants' Parties.

Our Parties are weak ideologically and organisationally, their influence among the masses is growing, but they have not organised in a Bolshevik manner big sections of agricultural labourers and peasants in their own ranks. They are asking themselves the question: How are we to establish an organisational connection between our Party and the masses under our influence? Our Parties have solved this problem in various ways. Some of them, for instance, the Colombian and Chilean Parties, have simply transformed the mass trade union movement into a political party of the Chilean proletariat. For a long time — and in Colombia even now — there was no organisational separation between the Party and the Trade unions. This is of course a primary stage which we must overcome, because the Party and the trade unions must suffer from this organisational confusion.

Other parties solved this problem in a different way. The Socialist Party of Ecuador has been formed on the model of the Belgian Labour Party; it is based on individual membership and collective affiliation of trade union organisations under the leadership of the Communist Party.

This is not a perfect type of organisation. The Communist Party has degenerated into a kind of sect, almost free masonic in regard to the admission of members, with a special and secret ritual and without mass recruiting. We must also combat the idea of the formation of a kind of Labour and Farmer Party under the leadership of a small Communist group.

When the Kuomintang was playing an important role in China, our Comrades in Brazil discussed the advisability of forming a Kuomintang which was to coordinate the organisations of the revolutionary petty bourgeoisie, those of the working and peasant classes, trade union organisations and the C. P. They abandoned this idea after the failure of the Kuomintang in China. At present they have joined a workers' and peasants' bloc which coordinates labour and peasant organisations. But there is the danger of certain petty-bourgeois elements succeeding in seizing this workers' and peasants' bloc.

I think that at the bottom of all these attempts we have the just and necessary pre-occupation of connecting the Communist Party, the vanguard of the proletariat, with the mass organisations of the workers and peasants and with the mass of the revolutionary petty-bourgeoisie for the revolutionary struggle; not only to form an occasional and temporary united

front with it, but to be able to lead these organisations in the revolutionary struggle. Of course the best way of leading these organisations is to have fractions in them and to work within their ranks in order to win the confidence of the masses and secure leadership in their organisations. I think that there is for our comrades a great danger of confusion if there be two parties, a Party of the proletariat and a party of the workers and peasants. The Communist Party will either degenerate into a sect as in Ecuador, or it will simply become absorbed by the workers' and peasant party and will not continue its Communist work. There is also another alternative: the workers' and peasants' party of Brazil — if we are not awake to this danger — might oppose the Communist Party at the decisive moment and develop into a mass Party hostile to the Communist Party.

We must therefore reject the proposal of forming workers' and peasants' parties in Latin America. We must find the solution of the problem of linking up the Communist Party with labour and peasant organisations in the form of a bloc in which the Communist Party will be the most influential and leading organisation, in which the Communist Party, by its fractions, will have a hold on the organisations affiliated to the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc by not admitting as adherents to this bloc the political organisations of the petty bourgeoisie with which we can practice the united front whenever this is opportune but which we must not organise in this bloc if we want to prevent its influence predominating even in our own ranks. Occasional united front with the organisations of the revolutionary petty-bourgeoisie and workers' and peasants' bloc which must be maintained and continually reinforced for the realisation of a whole historical stage of the development of the revolutionary movement, finally democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants, — such must be our general policy.

But the main, the fundamental question in Latin America is that of the development and consolidation of our Communist Parties, from the organisational and also the ideological viewpoint. The task of the international is — to help with all the means at its disposal our Communist Parties so as to enable them to become genuine Bolshevik parties, to raise their ideological level in order that the confusion which still exists in their ranks be eliminated, and that they might become mass parties, Communist in their ideology, their organisation, etc.

For this work tact is required on the part of the C. I. It cannot go to these parties with the 21 conditions and say: if you do not accept them and do not carry them out, we will expel you from the Communist International. We must proceed cautiously and tactfully so as not to dissociate the already developed comrades from the mass of the workers and peasants who want to struggle with us under the banner of the Communist International.

We must combat especially in the labour movement, in the trade unions and even in our own ranks the relics of anarcho-syndicalism and the efforts made by Amsterdam and the American Federation of Labour to bring the labour movement of South America under the influence of Yankee or British imperialism in order to poison it with reformism and divert it from the revolutionary struggle for the benefit of Wall Street financiers. Moreover we must struggle against reformism which still exists in its corporative and mutual benefit organisations, we must bring the trade union movement onto the path of the revolutionary trade union movement, we must link it up with the International proletarian movement and must at the same time cleanse our Parties of all reformist ideology. We must act with circumspection and tact, bearing in mind in what epoch we are working and the importance of the Latin American movement in the struggle against the most powerful imperialism. We must reinforce our Parties ideologically to enable them to become mass Parties capable of playing in the revolutionary movement a leading role and remaining at the same time in contact with the masses. The C. I. must help our Parties to become genuine Bolshevik Parties. Only on this condition will the revolutionary movement of Latin America attain its historical objects and promote the development of the bourgeois revolution into a socialist revolution, into a real dictatorship of the working class. In regard to all these problems I have laid draft theses before the colonial commission which must determine the general tactical lines of the Latin American movement. I think that this is the path to be pursued in the future by the C. I. and our Communist Parties. (Applause.)

Discussion on the Questions of the Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies.

Comrade HELLER (Communist Fraction of the R.I.L.U.):

In the part of the theses dealing with the nature of imperialist policies in colonial and semi-colonial countries, it is stated that the export of capital to the colonies and the role of financial capital is only a casual phenomenon there, and not a characteristic of the present period. This is not the case in reality. The characteristic features of the present colonial policies of the imperialist powers have to do precisely with the connection existing between the banks and the heavy industries in the colonies, as well as with the exportation of capital to the colonies. The essential features of contemporary colonial policies (as distinguished from those which existed in the past) consist precisely in the specific methods of exploitation employed by financial capital.

Let us examine the export of capital in the shape of guaranteed loans to the colonies. Formerly, during the period of simple commodity exchange, China, or let us say, the African colonies were unable to build railways, to purchase the necessary rolling stock, machinery, etc. The banks of the imperialist countries guaranteed credits to the colonies and semi-colonies, thus enabling them to do these things, but at the same time they studied the interests of their own big industries engaged in the building of railways, etc. Thus, it is precisely the exported capital which enables the imperialist capital to penetrate into all the economic pores of the oppressed country, and to accomplish the process of impoverishment among all the elements of its population in a far larger measure than this was possible under the old methods of colonial policy. It is precisely the export of capital which becomes more and more the source of the growing aggressiveness of the imperialists, since numerous troops and warships are required to "secure" the principal and interest on the loans advanced to the colonies. This role of financial capital and of capital exports to the colonies and semi-colonies must be stated more definitely in our theses.

Besides, the very process of industrialisation in the colonies and semi-colonies is not properly and accurately elucidated in the Theses. The theses contain no mention of the fact that imperialism introduces also in the colonies the modern technical improvements and rationalisation which are combined with pressing down the wages and with the unheard of exploitation of the workers.

In the Theses it is flatly asserted that the development of engineering works in the colonial countries is only feeble, or it does not exist at all. Nevertheless, the facts tell us that such an assertion is not entirely correct. Thus, in Shanghai all the modern machinery for the textile industry is turned out on the spot. There are also extensive shipbuilding yards, and so on.

And now we come to the next part dealing with the types of colonial countries. This study is exceedingly complex, and it is quite natural that some defects have crept in. If we take the second group, for instance, we find the Philippines alongside of the Union of South Africa. The explanation given in the Theses is that the industrial development of these two countries has reached the same level as in China, Indonesia and India. It is stated further that this group is characterised by increasing immigration from the imperialist countries, which leads to antagonism between the native and the white workers. This situation is indeed characteristic of the Union of South Africa, but it has absolutely no bearing on the Philippines. Furthermore, it ought to be observed that the Philippines are a good deal behind South Africa as regards the level of industrial development. Neither can there be any talk of any more or less considerable emigration from the capitalist countries to the Philippines.

As regards the fourth group, it needs no fundamental argument. Apparently, this group includes those colonial and semi-colonial countries which could hardly be classified among the other groups.

Furthermore, it ought to be observed that although all the colonies and semi-colonies have been divided into four categories, the analysis given in the Theses relates chiefly to the first category, i. e., China and India. At the same time particular stress is laid upon the significance and importance of the agrarian question in the countries of the first group. Nevertheless it is also necessary to point out that the agrarian question is of no less importance in the Negro colonies than it is in China and in India.

A fairly sufficient place is extended to China in the Theses. Yet the same cannot be said as regards India. This is all the more striking, since Comrade Kuusinen himself has laid stress upon the importance of the revolutionary movement in India, and that not only because India is the second largest state in the world and the classical type of colony, but also because India is upon the threshold of a profound political crisis. Furthermore, the description of the post-war period in India contains a series of errors. Thus, it is stated for instance that the Indian national economy, particularly the Indian industry acquired for the first time a rapid development during and after the world war. This does not tally with the facts. For instance, if we consider the Indian textile industry, we find that this branch was much more quickly developed immediately before the war than it was during the war.

It is said further in the Theses, that the "sham Parliamentary reform" of 1919 had caused a subsidence of the revolutionary tide in India. In reality the very opposite has been the case. The great spread of the mass movement in India took place precisely on account of and in connection with this reform. It is said further that the mass movement in India has retrogressed in the last year. But this was not due to the petty economic concessions made to the Indian bourgeoisie, as it is asserted in the Theses; it was rather due to the lack of an independent proletarian leadership, and to the fact that the whole movement was therefore under the influence of the national bourgeoisie, and particularly of the petty bourgeoisie.

The negative attitude of the Theses as regards decolonisation should be considered as absolutely proper, because notwithstanding the industrialisation of the colonies, notwithstanding the increased export of capital, there are no signs of decolonisation to be observed either in India or in the other colonies and semi-colonies.

The draft theses submitted to this congress constitute the first attempt at an elaborate Marxian Leninist presentation of the manifold and complex course of development in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. With the help of these Theses it will be possible for us to facilitate the political orientation of our Parties to a considerable extent, in Western Europe as well as in America and in the colonial countries. After the elimination of the few faults and defects contained in the draft, these theses will constitute a weapon which will be of inestimable service in uniting the proletarian front with the colonial countries.

Comrade CARNEY (Ireland):

Comrade Murphy, in the debate on the speech of Comrade Bukharin mentioned that there had been an omission regarding Ireland. We find a similar omission on the question of colonial policy, and I think the Comintern must cease to disregard Ireland. It is also necessary for Communist Parties in the metropolitan countries to understand the relationship to the movements in the colonies.

The Communist Party of Britain is of the opinion that in any action directly connected with the colonies and the Empire — the Mother Country — that the initiative and responsibility rests in the main, upon the colonial Parties. This is the view that was adopted at the Profintern Congress against the protest

of the Irish delegation. It is a wrong view, which should find no place in the Comintern.

In Ireland we have British trade unions. The men who delivered letters were members of a British union, the Post Office Workers. The British trade union officials decided to give up these Irish workers to the Irish unions. The men and women shop-assistants in the food stores were also delivered over to the Irish Unions. But the British trade union leaders will not agree that the men who belong to the Railwaymen's Union, the men who transport soldiers and munitions in times of civil war, are organised in Irish unions, they want to keep them under British direction. These leaders are part of British imperialism in Ireland. And this Congress should make it obligatory for the British Party to take up in its trade union programme and in its immediate work, the demand for the withdrawal of British unions from Ireland. We are working on these lines. It is a hard task. We find the Irish employers boosting the British unions. Irish railway managers will rather negotiate with Thomas than with Larkin, and so the British unions are industrially against us — politically they stand as a menace to the Irish workers. Therefore, the Irish Party urges that this demand for the withdrawal of British unions shall not be sidetracked.

Comrade Heller dealt with the attempted penetration of the Indian movement by the British Trades Union Congress. The British workers should raise the slogan "Hands off the Indian Trade Unions". But the British Trade Union Congress is trying to gain control over one or two unions in India and they will play the same role in India as they are playing in Ireland. We should not lose sight of this fact.

At the II. Congress, Comrade Lenin told of a conversation with a Finnish worker, who said to Comrade Lenin: "There is now a clear understanding among us revolutionary workers that when the hour strikes, it will be necessary to settle accounts with the White Social Democrats first, then we can proceed to fight the bourgeoisie."

"These simple sentiments", declared Comrade Lenin, "constitute a political maxim." In 1923, when Comrade Larkin returned from America, that was the basis of his policy. We find the Labour Party in Ireland on the side of the Free State, directly imperialist. It demonstrated that at the British Empire Conference when it voted against self-determination for India. But the Fianna Fail is anti-imperialist; the Irish Republican Army is anti-imperialist, and the Irish Workers' League is also anti-imperialist, all these constituting the elements working in Ireland against British imperialism. We fight against imperialism together, maintaining our identity on the basis of a real united front. In the elections we said: Fight for the Irish Workers' League first; secondly, fight for the Fianna Fail.

The British Party in the elections of 1927 advised the workers of Ireland to fight for the Irish Workers' League, and then for the Social Democrats. This is a great political mistake. It shows there is a lack of understanding on the part of our British comrades of the position in Ireland. You cannot associate with those who are lackeys of imperialism, just as the British Party cannot associate with the lackeys of imperialism in England. In the fight against imperialism you cannot associate with anybody who is part and parcel of the imperialist camp.

Speaking on the Programme, Comrade Garlandi of Italy mentioned that slight attention has been given to the agrarian problems; in dealing with the colonial policy, we must deal with the question of the peasantry. We in Ireland are confronted with the same problem. In the Irish Free State there are 436,000 agricultural holdings, 67% of these are ranged from 30 acres down. The C. I. has given us no lead in the question of dealing with this peasant problem. We have said to the peasants: "refuse to pay rents". We have told them that when a Workers' and Peasants' Government is established they will give them better machinery. We shall mortgage off their land, we can prevent the bankers from exploiting them, but what is the peasant going to do now? How are we going to engage in our immediate work with the peasantry? These questions must be answered.

There ought to be more delegations from the peasants to the U. S. S. R. The illiteracy of the peasants renders it very

difficult for us to make propaganda amongst them, but if they could come here to Russia and see how the agrarian policies are carried out, it would be very effective.

We, in Ireland, are going to have, at the end of next year, the electrification of Ireland by the development of what is known as the Shannon Scheme. There is the penetration of Ireland by American capital. The opposition party of De Valera is pro-American. The Free State Party is pro-British. The question will be that in the next war, we will have on the one side the employing class being for Great Britain and on the other side, 75% of the masses pro-American. In a country like Ireland there must be more propaganda amongst the Irish in America and amongst the Irish in Britain also. The responsibility for creating a revolutionary proletariat and peasantry in Ireland must not be left to the Irish Party, but the American Party and the British Party, working through the Comintern can assist us in Ireland to create a revolutionary machinery to overcome British imperialism.

Comrade BANDERAS (Communist Fraction of the Peasant International):

Comrades, just a few words on the Theses upon the colonial question. Generally these Theses are well worked out and contain a good deal that is of value. Nevertheless the form of the Theses is rather heavy, and it has been extremely difficult for many comrades from the colonies to study them. I therefore propose that the form of the Theses be somewhat altered. These Theses are rather too much overcharged; furthermore, some important and kindred questions, which might be brought together under one chapter, have been scattered in various places. Thus, the question of the united front of the workers and peasants has been scattered through various places in the theses; yet this is a question of tremendous importance to the colonial movement, and it should therefore be stated in a more concentrated form. Some points ought to have been more developed in the Theses. Thus, it ought to be observed as regards point 25 dealing with the ideological struggle of the Communists and the proletarian organisations against the bourgeois-reformist tendencies, that this ideological struggle can best be conducted by means of putting up concrete demands.

It should have been indicated in the Theses, what are the general points of contact among the workers and peasants in their struggle, both against the bourgeoisie and against imperialism. Thus, in a number of countries the revolutionary organisations of the workers and the peasants come into contact in the struggle against the feudal reaction, in the struggle against militarism, and in the struggle against the clergy. These questions should have also been treated in the Theses as the general points of contact for the formation of the united front between the workers and the peasants.

Then we find that in the theses the question of the trade union organisation of the agricultural proletariat is omitted, and this is a highly important and essential question, for instance, in the Philippines, in Indonesia, and in many of the Latin American countries. It is therefore essential to have the significance of the organisation of the agricultural proletariat pointed out in the theses.

I now come to the questions relating to Latin America. This question has been chiefly dealt with by Comrade Humbert-Droz. Whilst his standpoint was right on the whole, he made some substantial errors, and in one place he even advanced a somewhat harmful idea. If one bears in mind the present revolutionary movement and the role played by the petty bourgeoisie in the revolutionary movement in Latin America, and if one wants to understand this movement aright, one cannot agree with the argument made by Comrade Humbert-Droz, who said that the movement against the Spanish and Portuguese conquerors was a movement of the landowners and an after-effect of the Spanish war. This does not fully state the case. Of course, the landlords took part in this emancipation movement, and there was a conservative tendency among those who fought for independence. Nevertheless these elements took part in the struggle for independence only because Spain was too weak to support the feudal regime in the colonies. Just

because Spain was too weak to take up arms for the defence of her rule in the colonies, the feudal rulers took upon themselves this task, and thus a conservative tendency arose in the struggle for independence, which was led by the clergy and the landlords, whilst on the other hand, a liberal movement of the petty bourgeoisie arose which sought an alliance with the peasants, and frequently even brought out the masses of the peasants upon the arena. This must be mentioned in order to make it clear that so far the petty bourgeoisie has played a fairly considerable role in the revolutionary movement in some places.

It was quite properly emphasised by Comrade Humbert-Droz that the development of foreign capital leads in no way to decolonisation, but on the contrary, it strengthens the colonisation and increases the colonial dependence of the Latin American countries upon foreign imperialism. There are very substantial proofs to substantiate this statement. For instance, the fact that the chief purpose of foreign capital in Latin American countries is to acquire the sources of raw materials and their exportation to the mother countries is proved by the fact that out of the total capital investments of the United States in Mexico amounting to 1380 million dollars, only 35 million dollars have been invested in the manufacturing industries, whereas the rest of the capital has been invested either in mining or in transport enterprises. The Mexican railways have been so far collared by the foreign capitalists that they serve the purposes of the export of raw materials and other transportation to United States ports, but they do not serve the internal requirements of Mexico.

I now come to the question as to the character of the Mexican revolution, and here I have to differ from Comrade Humbert-Droz, when he speaks of a lull in the Mexican Revolution at the present moment. To begin with, Comrade Humbert-Droz contradicts himself when he says in one place that the tide of the revolution had subsided in Mexico because the bourgeoisie has reached an understanding with the imperialists, and in another place he speaks of the chances of the Communist Party in Mexico, saying that in the immediate future the Communists are going to play a decisive role in the leadership of the revolutionary movement. Comrade Humbert-Droz himself says that a bourgeois-democratic revolution is now going on in Mexico, and since there is a bourgeois-democratic revolution going on, it stands to reason that the Communist Party and the revolutionary peasant organisations must gain the leadership of this movement, and this is what they are going to do. If so, there can be no talk of a decided decline of the revolutionary tide in Mexico as it was done by Comrade Humbert-Droz. It is true, the bourgeois elements are receding. But since according to Comrade Humbert-Droz' definition a bourgeois democratic revolution is going on, it is quite clear that in view of the desertion of the bourgeois elements there can be no talk of a recession of the tide in Mexico, because such desertion of the bourgeois elements has already taken place in 1911; besides, the whole history of the Mexican revolution has been a succession of ebb and flow, and the present ebb is only a link in this long chain of vicissitudes, but does not denote a distinct decline of the revolution.

We Mexican Communists decidedly object when Comrade Humbert-Droz advances a new idea of Latin-Americanism. We believe the propaganda of such a slogan on the part of Communists would be extremely dangerous, because in the revolutionary struggle against American imperialism it is of tremendous importance to have unity of action, as well as permanent contact with the Communist Movement in the United States. This idea of Latin-Americanism would carry grist to the mill of those bourgeois and petty bourgeois tendencies which want to defeat both the North American and the Latin-American proletariat. Why? Because there is just now a new anti-imperialist tendency directed against this tendency, and it is actively supported by the Communist Party. We have a whole number of bourgeois and petty bourgeois anti-imperialist tendencies in the organisations of intellectuals who are advancing this very idea in their press and in their propaganda, that the American working class is marching in the train of American imperialism, and that therefore the working class of Latin America should have nothing to do with the working class of the United States.

Therefore, this slogan of Latin Americanism might lead in many places to a strengthening of petty bourgeois psychology within the Latin American Parties, thereby increasing the influence of the different petty bourgeois groups upon the workers' and peasants' organisations.

In connection with the Latin-American and Mexican question, I should like to draw attention to one question and to one detail which plays a fairly large role, namely, the participation of the Communist Parties in the different petty bourgeois organisations. It must be borne in mind that in Mexico and in the other Latin American countries the Communist Parties have taken part not only in the peasant organisations, but also in the different petty bourgeois political organisations, in the petty bourgeois parties. A lively discussion is just now going on upon this question among the comrades in Latin-America and in Mexico. There is a fairly strong current in the Party which maintains that the Communists should join the petty bourgeois organisations and even the petty bourgeois political parties to which the workers belong, in order to break up such petty bourgeois political groups and in order to carry on Communist propaganda² among the workers and peasants belonging to such organisations. Of course, there is no need to have details on such questions elaborated in the Theses, but it is essential that the Latin American sub-commission should seriously study this question, if only for the fact that this participation in petty bourgeois organisations and groups is frequently fraught with the danger of the penetration of the petty bourgeois ideology and petty bourgeois elements into the Communist Party.

Comrades, I believe it is highly useful that the Congress of the Comintern has finally taken up so closely the question of Latin America, because nearly all the Latin American countries, or at any rate the majority of them, are at the present time in a revolutionary situation, and because the bourgeois democratic revolution which has experienced such tremendous development in Mexico is now developing in many of the Latin American countries. In this connection a whole series of new questions arises, particularly questions relating to the organisation of the peasant movement, the question of the united front of the workers and peasants, and the question of anti-imperialist work. All these essential questions require the proper solution, and this proper solution cannot be given unless the Comintern devote the proper attention to Latin America. (Applause.)

Comrade VOROVSKY (China):

Comrades, I shall speak today on the Canton uprising and the opportunist and putschist danger in the Chinese Party.

The Canton uprising is especially important because it was the first Soviet established in the East. It has exercised in fact the functions of a Soviet in the organisation of the uprising, in the leading of the uprising and the establishment of power in the form of Soviets. The Canton uprising has been tremendously depreciated by Comrade Pepper and shamefully calumniated by the Trotskyists and the opportunists of all colours. Some have said that the time was premature; others said that the social basis was insufficient; and still others, the Trotskyists, say it was a pure adventure. It is for the Congress to defend the uprising because the Canton uprising is of the greatest importance in the revolutionary history of the East. We as Communists should fight against all these opportunist declarations.

Firstly, the Canton uprising grew out of the struggles of the Canton workers and peasants. It took place at a time when the Soviet Government had been established in the Heilufun districts, that is the East of the City of Canton, for three months already. It took place after a series of peasant uprisings in the Eastern River regions of Kwantung province, and in the North River region of the Kwantung province. It took place at the time when a Soviet Government had already been established in the Island of Hainan.

Ever since October 14th, we have seen strong mass struggles of the Canton workers. There was the seamen's strike on October 14th, when the seamen gathered in open

meetings in spite of the white terror and succeeded in calling a general one-day strike of all the seamen in Canton. They recaptured their union, drove away the reorganisation committee which was appointed by Li Ti-sin, and held a demonstration in which not only 5000 seamen took part but another 5000 of Canton strikers and workers. On that day, the Red banners of all the unions of Canton were carried through the streets of Canton, past the Government houses, past the police stations, under the slogans: "Release the political prisoners", "Freedom to the workers and peasants unions", "Restoration of all rights which had been won", "Maintenance of the privileges of the Strikers", "Down with the new militarists — Li Ti-sin, Chang Kai-shek, Fu-pei", "Down with the reorganisation committees". This movement started as a seamen's strike and developed to a movement of all workers in Canton and the peasants around Canton.

The yellow reorganisation committees of all the unions fled into hiding. Three of the committee members who did not escape were killed by the masses in the demonstrations. From this day on began a movement of the Canton workers for the ousting of all the reorganisation committees of the unions, for the release of the political prisoners, for the legal existence of the unions. It continued until more than 90 unions gathered at open meetings under the name of the "Canton workers delegates assembly" which had been underground till then. There it was decided to set up again the Canton workers delegates and drive out the reorganisation committees. These 90 unions represented at least a mass of 100,000 workers. Chang Fa-kuei began to arrest the workers and to suppress our movement, but in spite of this persecution the railway workers of Canton again demonstrated and demanded the reinstatement of the railway workers who had been dismissed by Li Ti-sin. When Wang Chin-wei came to Canton with a special instruction to pacify the masses, they turned against him. In that demonstration about 60 workers were arrested. In spite of that, on November 7th, the anniversary of the October Revolution, the workers again gathered at a demonstration in Canton under the Red Flag and even invited the Soviet Representative to deliver a speech. The militarists waited for the arrival of the Soviet Consul, and then stopped him from attending the meeting. But from that moment we see that the counter-revolutionary militarist Government already could not control the masses. From this moment on we see demonstrations in the streets; the sabotage of the chauffeurs in Canton; the strike of the mechanics; the restoration of the printers' union. We have seen meetings in the countryside and suburbs of Canton. This movement developed without interruption till the moment of the Canton uprising.

Secondly, the uprising was organised before April 14th, that is before the counter-revolution of Li Ti-sin in Canton. Li Ti-sin had crushed the uprising before it took place. After that, the Cantonese were preparing for an uprising in the expectation that the Wuhan Government would come to their assistance. But when the Wuhan Government also became reactionary, they again expected that Li Ti-sin's army would come to Canton. But this again did not happen, and only then the Cantonese workers began to realise that they could not expect anything from outside, and that they would have to rely on themselves. From that moment a more serious organisation was started, first only as a district organisation, and afterwards it was changed into an organisation of the Red Guards on the basis of the trade unions.

At first 5000 Red Guards were organised, but as a result of the defeat of the "Canton Hong-Kong strike Committee" by Wan Chin-wei, only 2500 Red Guards were left. This was the great tragedy of the Canton workers. They organised automobile groups, groups to destroy the organisation of the secret police, and a special organisation to make bombs and collect other war material. They also had their organisation among the troops. The organisation was very weak, it was limited to one regiment which participated in the strike. In addition, Manifestoes and literature were distributed among other troops.

Before the strike, preparations for an uprising were also made among the peasants. First an instruction was sent to Hailufeng telling them to be prepared to advance on Canton. Second, the peasants in Tonkan were also told to make an

uprising about September 13th. Then the peasants in the West River region were told to make their preparations. Then about 1000 soldiers, under Communist leadership, were told to advance on Canton. We can say that these peasants actually made uprisings. Only they made them two days later when the Canton uprising had already been defeated. There were uprisings in Huanshin and also in the city of Kongmoon, a big city near Canton. There were also disturbances in Fatshan, a city west of Canton.

We have to refute another assertion, that is, that the Canton Soviet was not elected. The Canton Soviet was elected three days before the uprising at a meeting to which 70 trade unions sent delegates. This was very difficult to organise because to hold a meeting of about 80 men in the city of Canton under the white terror is something unusual. If anybody says that such a meeting is not representative, then we reply that it was the most representative meeting which was ever held under the circumstances.

It is true, the Canton uprising suffered from weak leadership, both politically and especially militarily. There was not a military organ which could organise the masses and the red guards immediately after the uprising. After the uprising, we paid too much attention to the police headquarters, and neglected the military headquarters. Therefore, the military headquarters were never captured. Our military leadership, instead of concentrating all its attention on the military headquarters, neglected the most important point; it ought to have organised one or two divisions of troops to start an offensive immediately in Honan, i. e. through the river of Tsukiang. It was not done. Therefore, instead of adopting an offensive position, we made an attack only on a part of the city. It went on for two days, because in the small streets of Canton, it is very difficult to operate. Owing to this mistake, the militarists were able to concentrate their troops in the North, South, East and West, which crushed us. This was due to the fact that we had not organised the troops, and had not made a plan for the retreat. This was a criminal mistake. Secondly, before the Canton uprising, not enough was done in arousing the masses. As a result the great masses did not take part in the Canton uprising. Comrade Pepper says only about two or three thousand people took part in the uprising. This is absolutely wrong.

It is said that after the correction of the opportunist mistakes the Chinese Communist Party went to another extreme, to putschism. This is not in accordance however, with the facts, because we say that even now we have very strong right tendencies in the Party and very influential forces are still working in this direction. For instance, in Shanghai, there are comrades who put forward such a theory, that the revolution has been defeated.

"There is a great danger in the peasant uprisings because they are anarchistic and the proletariat may lose hegemony in the revolution."

They put forward such slogans that the time is not suitable for big struggles, even economic struggles. This is wrong. There were other comrades who opposed this. They declared that the big struggles must involve the big masses, then we are for these struggles. But if the big struggles are only to lead to radical demands being set up then we are against it. But we must say we are against those comrades who say that the time is not suitable for big struggles and that we must only concentrate on small struggles. This is an opportunist mistake.

These comrades also said that we have to join in a movement for the restoration of a mass movement of the Kuomintang. They say there are unions already demanding the restoration of a mass movement. But this is not a real movement of the masses. Other comrades are against this slogan. They say it is not a slogan of the masses, the textile and industrial workers of Shanghai did not put it forward because they know that the Kuomintang cannot give them a mass movement. To give them enough freedom for a mass movement would mean to give the workers an opportunity to develop forces which would eventually overthrow the Kuomintang. These opportunistic comrades have even brought out such a slogan as a united front, because they said that the

unions are demanding it. In fact this is not a demand of the masses. It is a slogan put forward by the Kuomintang trade unionists because there exist two rival unions in the Kuomintang at present.

These opportunistic tendencies emanate from very influential comrades, and have even crept into the Central Committee and the Political Bureau because the Political Bureau passed a resolution that we should put forward the slogan to convene a rural national assembly and to demand the restoration of a mass movement.

I do not agree with those comrades who say that previously there were opportunistic mistakes and that they do not exist any more now. We will have to fight against these opportunistic tendencies.

Comrade Haidar (Palestine):

Comrades, the Arab problem, the Arabian East, is absent in the theses as well as in the reports on the colonial question.

I believe that since the Indian problem has been put on the order of the day, it is high time to take up the Arabian question. This question is of tremendous importance, because we have here in a relatively small place a large number of important problems and questions concentrated, a number of different types of imperialist policy, and of varieties of colonial bondage. We see here everything — from the shameful slavery of the Soudan to the refined form of slavery according to the latest feat of imperialist wisdom, the mandate system.

The force of the revolutionary movement has gone through the following stages. The first period — from 1917 to 1922, during that period the imperialist powers are only beginning to frame their plans for the partition and occupation of these countries. During this period we saw an extraordinary growth of the revolutionary movement. The British had to increase their troops in the Iraq to 120,000 men; France had to maintain in Syria an army of 120,000 men, and many thousands of British soldiers were held in reserve in Palestine, Egypt and Soudan. In Egypt there was a strong type of revolution which embraced all the elements of the population — “from the fellahin to the family of the khedive”, as it was put by a certain imperialist. In the country districts there were numerous risings and revolts and demonstrations, and the whole series of assassinations — during a short period there were 260 successful terrorist acts carried out.

In the Iraq the guerilla warfare took the shape of regular battles in the course of which the British troops sustained over 8,000 casualties.

In Syria we witnessed a whole series of guerilla insurrections which were described as banditism in the official reports of the French general staff.

In Palestine there were Jewish progroms, as the British incited one nation against the other in order to sidetrack the nationalist movement.

In spite of its tremendous power, British imperialism was forced to make some compromises.

The Iraq mandate was annulled and substituted by a “voluntary” treaty; Egypt was declared an “independent country”, while Churchill annulled in the White Book the famous Balfour declaration concerning Palestine. Imperialism capitulated, and the so-called honeymoon of the native national bourgeoisie began. Encouraged by the political concessions obtained, the bourgeoisie gathered its forces, the national economy began to develop, and a rapid growth of capitalism was observed in the provinces, particularly in the domain of agriculture. The whole picture was changed: the old patriarchal feudal order on the land had collapsed, the communal ownership of the land (“Mushaha”) was given up and its place was taken by private ownership. Hand in hand with the development of private ownership in the land, there developed the capitalist forms of agriculture, the concentration of the soil, and the centralisation of the rural economy. A strong process of differentiation began among the fellahin in the villages: there appeared the kulak, a figure hitherto unknown in the village, and by his

side the landless agricultural labourer. The old division of the village into “Homullah” (clans) gave place to the new division into classes. The place of the old feuds among the clans, blood vengeance etc., was taken by class antagonism and class conflicts. The countryside began to grow. The middle peasants began to dig up their hoards of gold coins and to purchase live stock, machinery and implements. The capacity of the home market grew, the local industries developed; in short, the capitalist development went on at an accelerated pace. The relations with the imperialists became strained again, and the centre of the nationalist movement was shifted from Central Arabia to the industrial and commercial districts, to Syria, Iraq and Palestine. At the same time a realignment of the forces went on. Instead of the old feudal and tribal divisions there came the new class divisions. As the class character of the society grew, its different manifestations became more and more pronounced. Not only was the bourgeoisie above the old feudal elements as regards culture, but it proved far more tractable and amenable to peaceful negotiations. It was in its ranks that the so-called national reformism emerged and developed.

During that period there was also manifested a second characteristic aspect of the revolutionary movement in these countries: there arose the labour movement. If we draw a comparison between the labour movement of these countries and that of China we are struck by the following facts: in China the working class became active as a class already at the outset of the revolutionary movement (the Northern expedition, the Shanghai revolt), was organised in the trade unions, and had a party which actively participated in the events. The opposite situation was to be observed in the Arabian East, where the workers took the field after a tremendous delay. The working masses as such constituted only the cannon fodder during the revolts in Egypt and Syria, whilst they were entirely absent as a class, as an organised force. The Egyptian Communist Party began its activity, not with forming a common Kuomintang, not by supporting Zaglul-Pasha, but rather by bitterly denouncing him.

All this happened six years ago, before the spread of the tidings of the Chinese revolution throughout the East, and so the mistakes of the Egyptian Party, particularly its isolation, led to grave consequences, to a complete detachment of the revolutionary movement from the common national movement. The result was that the Wafd Party, the adherents of Zaglul, had put themselves at the head of the Egyptian workers. They gained the leading role in the organisations and in the rural districts, whilst the Communist Party made its appearance when the tide was already receding. We had to win the working class when the revolutionary movement was already declining. When the organised working class began to push to the foreground, the bourgeoisie sought to come to terms with the imperialists. I declare quite categorically that this striving after peace with the imperialists on the one hand, and the sham revolutionary attitude on the other hand, constitutes the very substance of the policy of Zaglul and the Wafd Party. This should be explained not only by their fear of the struggle and of revolutionary actions, but rather by their fear of the rival Communist influence. It is a well known fact that the British Delegation with Lord Milner at its head was boycotted by the whole people and it was only by means of threats that Zaglul was induced to negotiate with Lord Milner. Milner asked the Wafd Party: “Do you want it here in Egypt the same way as in Soviet Russia? Do you wish to court the bolshevist peril? And indeed, as soon as Zaglul got into power he began to smash the Confederation of Labour, our section of the R. I. L. U., and generally to persecute the labour movement. But here the Wafd Party began to meet with new difficulties. It needed allies, but it could not work hand in hand with the workers, and besides, it had lost every influence among the workers. It would like very much to work together with the imperialists, but the latter have neither the wish nor the ability to gratify the minimum of their demands. The imperialists want the Wafd Party as an opposition group, as a lightning conductor against the feudal elements, but on the other hand, they want to keep the Wafd within certain bounds and to keep an eye on its revolutionary influence.

What should be our attitude towards the Wafd? Some comrades believe that the revolutionary role of the Wafd has

already been played out; that it has now become a counter-revolutionary force; that it has associated itself with the counter-revolutionary forces, and that there can be no talk of an alliance with it. Nevertheless, comrades, I believe that by boycotting the Wafd we shall fall into the opposite extreme and commit a serious error. I might formulate our tasks in Egypt in the following manner: no formation of an alliance, no creation of common organisations, but a definite permanent contact with the Wafd, a contact upon the basis of concrete actions. The turning of the Wafd into a mass organisation, into a democratic organisation, would mean the creation of an apparatus against us, an apparatus which would strengthen even further the influence of national reformism.

You speak now about the formation of a workers and peasants' party. This is a mere utopia, not because there is a danger that the C. P. would become transformed into a petty bourgeois party by allying itself with the peasantry, but simply because this is impossible. There is no such Communist Party, there are no such cadres as might undertake the task of organising the peasantry. The peasantry should be handled in quite a different way. I therefore urge the formation of peasant (fellah) committees, co-operative societies, different economic organisations, e. g. mutual aid, legal aid, etc., to which the agricultural labourers, the fellahin and the poor peasants should be attracted. We must bear in mind, comrades, that the Egyptian fellah works six months in the year as a wage earner, and the other six months as a landholder, so that it is rather difficult to draw the line between the labourer and the small peasant.

Vassilev (from the floor): "How will you join these elements in the co-operative movement?"

They have common material interests. The fellah suffers from the speculators, and is dependent upon the usurers. There is a strong co-operative movement supported by the nationalists, and if we are looking for a basis for our activity, we must make use of it.

A few words about Arabia, Assyria, Palestine and Iraq. In Syria the national liberation movement suffered a great setback after the revolution, nevertheless the opposite thing has happened in that country from what took place in Egypt. It will perhaps be too strongly put, but I find no other words to express my thought. If the workers in China are resentful over the treason of the nationalists, e. g. Chang-Kai-shek, if we are all indignant over the alliance between the Chinese nationalists and imperialists, the opposite thing happened in Syria. At the moment of the revolutionary struggle, at the highest tide of the revolution, when the Syrian and Arabian nationalists fought with might and main, they were under the impression that they had been betrayed by the European proletariat. And this mistrust has not yet been dispelled. Now we are confronted with a big task: we must demonstrate that we are people of a different stamp from MacDonald who called himself a friend of the oppressed peoples, but who eventually acted in the same manner as the capitalists. Therefore the situation of the Communist Party in Palestine and Syria after the defeat of the Syrian revolution is a very difficult one. On the one hand, they have to unmask the traitors, the feudal elements, the representatives of the bourgeois democracy, and on the other hand they have to overcome the mistrust which has arisen among the native population against the European proletariat upon the aforesaid grounds.

Another problem, another danger which confronts us, is reformism. There has been a good deal spoken here about reformism, but I believe in no colony is it so strong as in Palestine. There we have a strong reformist organisation run by European imperialism and relying upon the Zionist movement, which has created for itself a strong basis. Although the labour movement is rather strong, nevertheless reformism is still stronger in Palestine. In the struggle against the communist influence it sticks to no means — from the cruel persecution of revolutionary workers to the hoodwinking of the workers by the illusion that a "communist paradise" would be set up in Palestine. They are building a "communist society" under the protection of the British mandate.

The Arabian East is now at the parting of the ways. As the result of the latest events in Egypt, the question now confronts us no longer theoretically, but thoroughly in a practical

shape. In view of the great events which are imminent in that country, we should not come too late. I maintain that if we stick to our present attitude, we shall positively be late.

I should like to conclude with the following remark. I believe that the greatest evil, or perhaps the greatest misfortune of the revolutionary movement in the East consists in the fact that it allows itself to be defeated singly in the different countries. When Egypt and Syria were quiet there was a strong movement in the Iraq. When the big miners' struggle took place in England, it was quiet in our country. But when the revolutionary movement started in the East there was tranquility in England. It is the task of the European proletariat not to lag behind the colonial movement, as has been the case hitherto. This is our main task in the East and the indispensable postulate of victory for the national liberation movement.

Comrade OMURA (Japan):

Comrades, the Japanese Delegation is, in general, in agreement with the draft theses presented by Comrade Kuusinen. In my opinion the merit of the draft theses lies in a vivid and lively analysis of the process of the bourgeois democratic revolution in colonial and semi-colonial countries.

However, I want to make some suggestions with regard to the draft theses. Firstly, in the first chapter dealing with "General" Antagonism and contradictions between imperialism and the colonial countries, which is one of the fundamental contradictions of our epoch, the imperialist epoch must be once more emphasised. The imperialists are trying to create new divisions in the colonies and semi-colonies. Imperialist troops invade these colonies and tramp upon the oppressed peoples. The danger of a new war is rising as a result of conquest and struggle for new colonies. If we speak of the industrialisation of India we cannot discuss this question quite separately from the war preparations of the British imperialists. Therefore, comrades, we think it is necessary to repeat once more the significance of the antagonisms between imperialist countries and colonies in the first chapter in general.

In the second chapter there is an analysis of the essence of the imperialist policy in the colonies. Certainly capitalism has passed through several stages, — the mercantile, the industrial and now the imperialist epoch — and there are also corresponding methods of exploiting and invading the colonies. The period of mercantile capital was characterised by wars and robberies and primitive methods of expropriation. The industrial period was characterised by penetration by means of cheap commodities, and in our epoch, the imperialist epoch, we see, side by side with robbery, plunderous wars and penetration of cheap commodities, the export of capital. The growth of productive forces in the colonies also gives rise to a new process in the colonies, and that is the growth of the native bourgeoisie and proletariat.

In general, the specific weight of the colonies and semi-colonies in the world economy is increasing. Here lie the contradictions of imperialism. The export of capital causes the growth of productive forces in the colonies and in semi-colonial countries, and promotes their industrialisation.

In paragraph 7, there is an analysis of the process of industrialisation of the colonies. Here Comrade Kuusinen speaks of "certain deviations from the general anti-industrialisation trend of imperialist colonial policy, due to the interest of finance capital". But in my opinion this is not "certain deviations", but a fundamental contradiction of imperialism. We see that the metamorphosis of capital is in our epoch completed on a world wide scale. The industrial capital of the mother countries functions in the colonies as money and trading capital. The process of metamorphosis of capital can be described, according to Marx, as follows: $M-C \dots P \dots C'-M'$. This process is completed on the world scale. The industrial capital in the mother countries buys the raw materials and food in the colonies. Previously, the bourgeoisie completed this process of production in the mother countries. Now in the epoch of imperialism this has changed. The process of production is conducted in the colonies.

Here lies the fundamental contradiction of imperialism, and here lie the antagonisms among the various groups of capitalists in the mother countries. Here also rise the contradictions between the big native bourgeoisie in the colonial countries and the imperialist countries. But this export of capital does not bring about a great industrialisation in the colonial countries, because exported capital is not invested in textile and iron industries, but in special branches of industry, i. e., rubber, sugar, tobacco, etc., etc. Hence the absence of the iron industry and even of textile industries in some colonies. This is the result of the decisive anti-industrialisation policy of the imperialists.

Finance capital does not want the industrialisation of the colonial countries but anyhow the capitalists are exporting to the colonial countries. These are the big contradictions of imperialism. Therefore, it is necessary to explain more concretely this process of industrialisation of the colonial countries and its relation to financial capital in the mother countries.

In spite of the considerable development of industry and the rapid transformation of land and farm products into commodities there still exist feudalistic relationships in agriculture. Usurious capital, extraordinary high rent, expropriation by means of high taxes, destruction of the small home industry of the peasantry and the pauperisation and proletarianisation of the peasantry — such are the characteristics of all colonial and semi-colonial countries.

In this connection I think it is necessary to mention in the theses forcible contracts, plantations and monopoly of water utilisation. In many colonial and semi-colonial countries there exists what is called forcible contract between the big capitalists and the small and poor peasantry, and the further development of this process is the expropriation of peasants' land. Then comes the ownership of large lands by the capitalists, that is the plantation system. In a series of Eastern countries, where agriculture needs artificial watering, the monopoly of water privilege by the imperialists has a great importance. Therefore, I think we must include these three things in the theses.

The agricultural policy of imperialism in the colonies consists in an alliance between the imperialists and the landed property holders and in giving support to the rich peasantry.

Further, the theses speak very little about the role of the social reformists in subjecting the oppressed peoples in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. It is absolutely necessary to expose the treacherous role of the Social Democrats, who at present in all countries are openly for the conquest of colonies.

The first and most important lessons of the great Chinese Revolution must be the basis of our attitude towards the national bourgeoisie. In the theses it is stated that "the bourgeois democratic tendency of the colonial bourgeoisie of these countries, considered fundamentally, is in no sense a revolutionary tendency. It is a reformist opposition." I think this formulation is absolutely correct. The Trotskyist opposition was wrong when it refused to see the objective revolutionary role played by the national bourgeoisie. But when we fought against the opposition even in the ranks of the Communists we spoke too much of the "revolutionary" native national bourgeoisie. The great Chinese Revolution showed that the betrayal of the national bourgeoisie is in any case inevitable and that, while entering into temporary agreement with the national bourgeoisie, we must prepare politically and organisationally for the future split with them.

Comrade Strakhov delivered a very interesting report, but it did not give a sufficient analysis of the various epochs of the Chinese revolution. Why has the Chinese revolution been defeated temporarily? The defeat of the Chinese Revolution was primarily due to the relationship of the class forces in China, not only nationally but on the international scale. Comrade Strakhov spoke very little on the role of the imperialists, and of the achievement of the Chinese Revolution; though there is a temporary defeat, we have to record that the proletariat for the first time obtained hegemony in the national revolution, that it attracted big sections of the peasantry to its side and built up the heroic mass Communist Party of China. There are basic achievements of the Chinese revolution which must be mentioned when we speak of the Chinese Revolution.

Comrade Strakhov mentioned that in those countries, where we can form a temporary agreement or bloc with the national bourgeoisie, the centre of our strategy must lie in our union with the peasantry. In my opinion, this idea, must be placed in the foreground because up to now we have discussed too much about the possibility of agreement with the national bourgeoisie. Lenin once said: "So far as we go with the peasantry as a whole, the revolution is the bourgeois democratic revolution." This union with the peasantry must be the central criterion of our strategy.

Comrade Strakhov did not speak of the organisational defects and mistakes made by the Chinese Communist Party. They should have had in view the inevitable betrayal of the national bourgeoisie and they should have prepared for the future split of the Kuomintang.

The theses hardly mention the military question in the colonial revolutions. Experience shows us that in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, in the process of the revolution, there may be open war with the imperialists. Then we must put the question of military preparations, of the national revolutionary armies. The experience of the Chinese revolution shows that the national revolutionary army, which was imbued with the idea of the national unification of China and the fight against the imperialists, was in the course of the revolution turned into an imperialist army. The Chinese Communist Party did not prepare well against this danger. Take, for instance, the army of Chang Kai-shek or Tang Shen-chi, where we had a big political apparatus, but when these generals betrayed the cause of the national revolution, the Communist nuclei hardly put up the least resistance. This shows how important is the question of military preparation.

Further, there are also lessons to be drawn by the whole Communist International from the uprisings in Shanghai and Canton.

Further, I suggest that after the 4th chapter, it is necessary to add a new chapter on the perspectives of the revolutionary movements in the colonial countries in the near future: in China, India, Egypt, Indonesia and South American countries; and then we can speak concretely of the prospects and tasks of the Communist Parties in those countries in the last chapter.

The theses emphasise the role of the Communist Parties in the colonial and semi-colonial countries in dealing with the national revolutionary movement. In my opinion, the Communist Party must be primarily based on the forces of the proletariat. Then we have to point out the serious defects and weaknesses of the Communist Parties in these countries. They are not only numerically and ideologically weak, but also in their social composition.

The Communist Parties of Turkey and Korea were infected with liquidationism. The Communist movement in Korea suffered from a constant factional struggle. In spite of the importance of the Korean revolution in destroying Japanese imperialism, and in developing the Chinese revolution, the Communists of Korea failed to put an end to the factional struggle in their ranks. However, the rise of the workers movement, and the heroism shown by certain active workers in the struggle with the reaction, the mass arrests, provocation and cruel tortures, serve as a proof that the Party of Korea on the basis of workers elements, will be able to unite their ranks.

In the draft theses "the organising of such (workers and peasants) parties is inadmissible" for "special workers' and peasants' parties, no matter how revolutionary they may be, can all too easily be transformed into ordinary petty bourgeois parties". I agree with this. Not only that, but where workers' and peasants' parties already exist, as in India, we must fight for the democratisation of these organisations, for the conquest of them and for winning over a considerable big section of these organisations.

The Congress of the Profintern formulated already partial demands for the workers' movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. In my opinion, it is necessary also to formulate partial demands for the peasant movements in those countries, such as confiscation of land from the landowners, the

overthrow of all feudals, including religious institutions, fight against usurious capital, fight against high taxes, utilisation of state land, question of rent, abolition of forcible labour, and so on.

With regard to the tasks of the Communist Party in the metropolis, the theses only mention support for the revolutionary movement in the colonies. I think they should be formulated more concretely and in detail. First, ideological and organisational contact between the Communist Party in the metropolis and the colonial countries: sending of comrades from the mother country into the colonies to help the Young Communist movement there. Second, support and contact between the national revolutionary movement of the colonial countries with the proletarian movement in the metropolis. Third, contact between the trade unions and peasant organisations in the metropolis and colonies. Fourth, active propaganda and agitation for the national revolution. Exposure of the colonial regime, of the conditions obtaining there, and propaganda among the workers in the mother country, explaining to them the significance of the national revolutionary movement, and especially conducting a fight against national prejudice among the toilers in the imperialist countries. Organising campaigns against colonial oppression. Fifth, to propagate the idea of self determination and complete separation of the colonial countries by means of uprisings and wars. The Communist Parties in the mother

countries must issue a series of pamphlets and leaflets, etc. for the propagation of these ideas. Sixth, work must be carried on among the workers of the motherland in the colonies and the armies of the imperialist countries sent to the colonial countries. Seventh, work among the immigrant workers from the colonial countries, as the Korean free workers in China and Japan, the Chinese workers in the United States, Java, Malay, South Africa, etc., Indonesian labourers in Holland, etc.

Finally, the Congress must call upon the Communist Parties of all countries to draft a programme of joint action and joint slogans for the Communist Party of the mother country and of the colonial countries. The Communist Parties in the colonial and semi-colonial countries must strongly propagate the idea of the union with the proletariat of the metropolis, and, especially with the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the U. S. S. R.

Lenin characterised our epoch as the epoch of wars and revolutions. The revolutionary movements in the colonial and semi-colonial countries are assuming greater importance in the process of the world revolution. We hope that the Theses will serve as a great weapon for the acceleration and guidance of these gigantic revolutionary movements.

(Close of Session.)

Thirty-third Session.

Moscow, 16th August, 1928 (Afternoon).

Continuation of the Discussion on the Questions of the Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies.

Chairman: Comrade Su (China):

Comrade KATAYAMA (Japan):

Comrades: I fully support the report and theses of Comrade Kuusinen. The theses must be carried out to full extent together with the war resolution to fight against Social Democracy and imperialism. To strike at the weakest spot of imperialism is the best strategy of combating capitalism, and the colonies and semi-colonies are the weakest spot of capitalism. Take away India and British imperialism will fall to pieces.

Our efforts should be concentrated on the building up of the Communist Party in all the colonies and semi-colonies.

As soon as the Communist Party is established, it is its first and foremost duty to train a staff of functionaries out of the working class. In order to become a real proletarian mass Party it must pay greatest attention to get a foothold in the factories, mines, in the transport services, etc., it must not forget to absorb the best elements of the revolutionary intelligentsia, especially the revolutionary inclined students. The intellectuals are the best tools of the exploiters to oppress the workers and peasants. Look at India, Korea and all colonies and semi-colonies. The bourgeois intelligentsia are selling their own people and country to foreign imperialism. They are betraying the very interests of the workers. To fight against the corrupt bourgeois intelligentsia and, expose boldly their rottenness to the masses of the colonies and semi-colonies is the most important duty of every Party.

It is true, the Communist movement in every country and in the colonies is started by intellectuals and carried on by them, but when a critical moment in the movement arrives they often betray the cause and go over to the side of the bourgeoisie. They have proved again and again that they have made of the Party a footstool for their own selfish interests and as soon as they attained their aim they trample down the interests of the proletariat. Yes, we must guard against the intelligentsia.

They are wavering elements and the factional fights and struggles are mostly carried on by these intelligentsia who are forgetting the real movement and the interests of the C. P.! I fully endorse Comrade Omura regarding his view on the Korean Communist movement. Factional struggle and fights only benefit the Japanese imperialists.

I advise my Korean Comrades to stop the factional struggle and to direct their fight against Japanese imperialism, uniting the revolutionary forces to build up the mass C. P. on the lines of the Korean revolutions of 1926 and 1927.

Until the C. P. gets hold of the masses, that is, as long as the Party leadership is in the hands of the intelligentsia, the C. P. will not grow into a mass Party. The Comintern has put much efforts into the Communist movement in the colonies like Egypt, Ireland and Korea ever since the IV. Congress of the Communist International, even before the IV. Congress, but we have yet no mass Communist Party either in Egypt or Korea. Both Korea and Egypt are important points to attack the imperialism of Japan and Great Britain at the time of war. But we have no sound C. P. in either country. To strike a blow at British imperialism is best to be done from Ireland and we have not yet a strong C. P. there.

We generally do not call the American Negroes a colonial people, but according to the colonial theses of the II. Congress, the American Negroes are a subject nation and treated like that of Ireland. The American Negroes were aroused by the late world war and various race riots took place at Washington, Chicago and Oklahoma. The Negroes are the best potential revolutionary factor in the American Communist movement, waiting only to be organised and mobilised and above all helped by the C. P. of America. It is a shame that we have only 50 or so Party members out of 13 or 14 Million Negroes in America! The C. P. of America should put up a propaganda slogan — self-determination and complete independence of the American Negroes, pointing to the living example of the Soviet Union.

Comrade MISIANO:

Comrades, all the preceding Congresses dealt with the Colonial question on general lines, and it is only at this VI. Congress that this question which is so important to the Communist world policy is dealt with for the first time with a thoroughness worthy of its importance.

Having listened to the important speeches made by comrades Kuusinen, Ercoli and Humbert Droz, several comrades who are closely connected with the Anti-Imperialist League have instructed me to draw attention to a lacuna which must be filled in our discussions and deliberations.

It is of the utmost importance to us carefully to examine the attitude and action of the two enemies who are confronting us, that is to say imperialism and its lackey, social-democracy. The Theses bring forward three important and immediate tasks for the liberation of the Colonies from imperialism and for the development of the colonial movement, that is to say the formation and development of Communist Parties in the various countries, work in the trade unions and alliance with the peasantry. But neither in the Theses nor in the speeches made here up till now has the double problem been mentioned: tactic in regard to the energetic struggle which imperialism has initiated against our movement in general and against the Anti-Imperialist League in particular, and the struggle which the social-democrats have just decided upon in Brussels after having studied and considered this question for a year and a half. With your permission I will say a few words on this point in view of the absolute necessity for the Congress to determine the practical tasks of the Communist Party in regard to the reinforcement and defence of the "Anti-Imperialist League".

I must first of all supplement what Comrade Ercoli has so magnificently explained by an analysis of the attitude of the social-democrats. When the Social Democrats were confronted with the problems raised by the Anti-Imperialist Congress in Brussels at the beginning of 1927, they were non-plussed, taken by surprise. The Brussels Congress aroused the sympathy of millions of colonies and attracted the attention of thousands of labour organisations; but at the same time it aroused the anger of the bourgeoisie and the Social Democracy.

Among the Social Democratic Parties a lack of a uniform attitude was noticeable; their members evince the most varied and contradictory views. This was the case in Brussels when Marteau and Lansbury, with a very strong group of Left Social Democrats, associated themselves with the Anti-Imperialist League. Fritz Adler and other Social Democrats took up, on the contrary, a very hostile attitude to the League. But the mass of Social Democracy took up a "wait and see" attitude.

After a period of hesitation, the bourgeoisie made its plan: a series of measures had been adopted against the Anti-Imperialist League. The French Government placed itself at the head of this repression. Senghor, the representative of the North African movement, was arrested and died in prison. The Dutch Government has started legal proceedings against Hatta, an Indonesian.

Great Britain gingered up the international police who had to watch all the comrades who had participated in the Congress. But all these measures of the bourgeoisie were not yet part of a definite plan, just as the attacks of the Social Democrats were not co-ordinated. It was only by successive measures that the bourgeoisie worked out a proper plan against the League. The Social Democrats have also adopted a definite attitude: the League must be combated; members of social-democratic parties and labour organisations which are under social-democratic leadership are, in the event of their individual or collective adherence to the League, to be expelled from the Party. The result of this was that in Great Britain, Holland, Belgium and other countries many Social Democrats have left the League. As usual Fritz Adler was the first to make the charge that this was a "manoeuvre of the Communists, a manoeuvre of Moscow", for the simple reason that Communists took an interest in the League.

Well, the Social Democrats met in Brussels, the same town where 15 months ago our clarion-call was sounded. They drew up a programme of action which is a disgrace for people who dare profess friendship for the colonial peoples.

I would like to lay stress on several points in the Social Democratic resolution of Brussels, which declares in regard to colonies with a high cultural level that:

"One must grant to colonial populations administrative independence if there is a desire for it among them."

That is all! And then again:

"Administrative posts in public institutions must be accessible also to the natives."

What a generous concession!

For colonies with a backward culture (tropics and sub-tropics) the Social Democrats demand that

"all land which is not yet occupied by Europeans must be declared the property of the natives. Every native family must be guaranteed the possibility of existence."

Well, the land which has not yet been expropriated by means of cannons and bayonets by the "civilisers" is barren-land. The Social Democrats want to give to the natives sandy and arid land which they are to fertilise with their sweat and blood.

Another part of the resolution says that foreigners who make too big profits must realise the necessity of giving up part of these profits for the benefit of the natives. Evidently Social Democrats have faith in the "kindness" of the white exploiters of Africa, America and the Indies!

Another part of the resolution says that as long as natives are not fit to have an administration of their own, Europeans must administer them. But the latter (the colonists) "must not have unlimited power."

In the "general" part it is said that the mandate system by which only a few colonies such as Syria, Palestine and Albania "are benefiting" at present, must be extended to all colonial countries. Such is Social Democratic justice! Thus the League of Nations has to divide all colonial and semi-colonial countries as mandates among the imperialist States which are thirsting for an extension of their power and exploitation possibilities!

This sounds like a letter of instruction issued by Chamberlain to the British representatives in Geneva. But it is the programme of the II. "socialist" International.

At the end of the programme, "it is recommended to all Social Democratic Parties to struggle for this programme by getting in contact with the oppressed peoples". It is clear that this struggle is not directed against the bourgeoisie which is only too pleased to get such loyal help, but against the Anti-Imperialist League and the revolutionary movement of the colonial countries. Thus the problem confronting us is perfectly clear: finding ways and means to defend the Anti-Imperialist League against the brutal attacks of the imperialist bourgeoisie and Social Democracy.

The Congress must take up a clear and definite attitude to these great problems, emphasise in its resolution the necessity of re-inforcing and defending the Anti-Imperialist League.

The "League" has an important problem to solve: to proceed from the "demonstration" made in Brussels at the Congress to the organisation of its ranks by issuing a fighting programme for the liberation of the colonies.

We must organise contact and connection between the revolutionary movement of the highly developed industrial countries of Europe and America and the colonial countries. We must strengthen the "League" in all countries through the affiliation of parties and trade unions, through the adhesion of as large sections of the population as possible. We must organise individual and collective adherents of individuals and organisations who accept the programme of the liberation of the colonies brought forward by the Anti-Imperialist League. This period of transition from demonstration to organisation must find the Communist Parties of all countries at their post.

We are fully aware of all the difficulties which arise mainly from the fact that there are in the Anti-Imperialist League many organisations and persons of diverse political tendencies. We must show great tact if we are to succeed in organising and

bringing into motion the masses for the liberation struggle of the colonial peoples. Communist Parties must be sympathetic and helpful in regard to the comrades whose mission it is to work through the Anti-Imperialist League in the colonial movement. In a word, the hopes and the will to fight of the colonial peoples must be understood and organised by us. Well, up till now organisational beginnings exist only in a few countries, mainly in Mexico and in the Indies.

A conference has just taken place in Great Britain which was attended by 343 delegates of various labour organisations. This conference has alarmed the Labour Party. Maxton and Cook declared themselves for the League and attacked together with the Communists the MacDonalds and Lansburys who either vacillate or are frankly hostile.

But there have been a number of collective and individual affiliations in many African, Asiatic, American and European countries. There are enormous numbers of colonies who want to be organised and an enormous number of proletarians who are willing to help them. Apart from this, we must watch the Social Democrats and prevent them from bringing disorder, confusion and strife into the various colonial countries. We must pay paramount attention to this question.

If we decide here on the work of Communists in the Anti-Imperialist League, if the Communist Parties do their duty in this direction we will be able to unite the colonial masses with the masses of the revolutionary European and American proletariat and create a great mass movement which will deal the deathblow to imperialism and the capitalist system. Comrades, by keeping watch over the Social Democrats and parrying the blows of the imperialists, you will help the Anti-Imperialist League to pursue the right path and you will have accomplished your Communist duty.

Comrade DARCY (Young Communist International):

Comrades, in the main I agree with the theses; there are, however, a few remarks that I would like to make on some of the questions.

I believe the theses do not deal sufficiently concretely with the situation in Latin America. Prior to the war, Great Britain had investments in Latin America totalling about 5000 million dollars, while the United States had investments in Latin America totalling about 1000 million dollars. Now, however, while the investments of Great Britain have remained stagnant, United States investments have increased to five thousand, two hundred million dollars. The rivalry between the United States and Great Britain has been increasing and becoming ever keener. It is in this connection that I think the theses have a shortcoming. They treat the role of the bourgeoisie, especially the industrial bourgeoisie in Latin America, just as the bourgeoisie in such colonies where the imperialist country has a monopoly on the exploitation of that colony. In some Latin American semi-colonies there is a tendency among the bourgeoisie to play a less revolutionary role, because the native industrial bourgeoisie is making alliances with one or the other of the imperialisms (England or America) in order to further its own ends. As a result it hampers the struggle of the masses and becomes dependent upon imperialism in order to obtain concessions from it.

In the four groups of colonies enumerated in the theses the Latin American countries are only mentioned in the first group. This gives a false impression. Both as regards the political and economic development Latin America is not a single unit in which all its countries have economically reached the same point of development. But on the contrary we have very many types of colonies represented, such as the so-called A. B. C. countries, Argentine, Brazil and Chile. We have a number of countries which have hardly any industrial development at all, in which there still exist semi-feudal relations. We have colonies where the landlords are the strongest factor. In Mexico we have what we can call a crystallising centre for all Latin American struggles against imperialism, and its role is therefore a much greater one than any of the other countries in Latin America.

This and other questions must be dealt with more in detail in the theses and the approach of the Comintern and of the Parties in the colonies and in the imperialist countries worked out.

A few words about the work of the Party and the League in the United States in relation to the colonial question. The theses do not deal at all with the tasks, nor do they estimate the work of the parties in the imperialist country in the colonial question. The American Party, thanks to the experiences of the other parties of the Comintern and having regard to the situation in Latin America, developed a number of general and concrete slogans with which it had carried on its work. One comrade, who spoke in the discussion, said that the American Party has neglected the struggle in Latin America. This is not true. It is true that considering the greatness of the task, the forces at the disposal of the American Party for this work are insufficient and must be strengthened if the proper amount of work is to be carried on. It is also true that errors have been made, that the best comrades were not charged with this work, and that the achievements are small compared with what is needed. However, on the other hand, we must say that the work of the American Party and League has been far in excess of what it has ever done before in this connection, and that both the American Party and the League have taken advantage of the situation in Latin America in order to carry on the struggle, by popularising the colonial struggle among the workers of the United States under such slogans as "Defeat the Nicaraguan Intervention", "Desert to Sandino", etc.; — such slogans as "The abolition of Financial Supervision by America", "Withdrawal of Troops", etc. —

The campaign of the American Party was carried out largely by the following methods: 1. demonstrations, mass meetings, etc., of a general character; 2. demonstrations in front of the navy yards and soldiers barracks, etc., with slogans denouncing and calling for the defeat of the many attempts of American Imperialism in Latin America; 3. the distribution of leaflets to soldiers and marines just prior to their leaving for Latin America and China; 4. the establishing of contact with some of the colonies, through the sending of comrades into some of the colonies for organisational work for the league and Party, 5. of course, all our anti-militarist work was centered around support of the colonial struggles.

What are the present tasks of the American League and Party and also of the Y. C. I. in this connection? First, I think we must try and establish a Young Communist League in every colony in Latin America, as now there exist only a few. I think we must strengthen the connections between the revolutionary forces in the colonies and the proletariat at home. We must bring delegations from the colonies and tour them throughout the United States and every imperialist country in order to popularise the cause of the revolution in the colonial countries and to bring it more graphically before the eyes of the proletariat at home. I think we must strengthen our propaganda among the colonial troops. I think that both the Comintern and the Y. C. I. must devote more attention to the problem, especially to the Latin American countries than has been done hitherto.

In this connection I must support the statement of Comrade Banderas when he said that it is a mistake to have the Latin American question dealt with by the Latin Secretariat of the Comintern and the Y. C. I. This question belongs politically in an all-American Secretariat, and the only connection it has with the other Latin countries, such as Italy, are language connections and not political connections. The Y. C. I. has made a big step forward in this connection when it organised for the World Congress of the youth, a special all-American conference in order to deal with the problems of the common struggle of the American Party, the League and the colonial youth against American Imperialism.

In the theses there is no mention of the problems of the colonial youth. Still the work among the youth in the colonies, cannot be only the task of the revolutionary colonial youth movement, but is also a task of the Parties. Such organisations as the Y. M. C. A., the student organisations of a reactionary character, the religious organisations which exist in the colonies, point to the tremendous problems that face us, and to

the importance of setting up in all colonies revolutionary mass Communist youth organisations which in most cases do not yet exist. Despite the importance of this problem, during the past year or two doubts have arisen as to the possibility of developing young Communist Leagues in the colonies into mass organisations.

I have no time to go into the merits of the question itself, but I must indicate that our experience in such colonies and semi-colonies as China, Mexico, have proven that it is possible to build up a mass Communist Youth League. In Mexico our Young Communist League is larger in membership even than our Party. But this problem does not only concern the youth but also the Parties. It is therefore incumbent upon the theses to deal with this problem and to give an answer to it.

There has developed in various countries, especially in China and the other colonies, both in the Party and in the Communist youth movement, tendencies which deviate from our course and have become and in the future can become dangerous. On the one hand proposals for the liquidation of the youth movement have come forth based on the conception that because the percentage of youth in the working class is very large, the problems of the youth become the problems of the whole working class and we therefore do not need a youth movement. And on the other hand, owing to the weakness of some Communist Parties, the youth have developed tendencies towards vanguardism. The Comintern and the Y. C. I. have dealt energetically with both the deviations as soon as they arose but I believe that now in the theses of the World Congress we must put this question clearly for the future, to make the road free for the development of Communist Youth Movements. Especially must we include it in the theses because these deviations are found also in the Parties.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the main tasks confronting us on the colonial question are not only in the colonies themselves, but also among the proletariat in the imperialist countries. The theses should set as one of the main tasks of the Communist International the close connection both organisationally and politically of the struggles of the colonial peoples with the struggles of the proletariat at home. It is true that we are already connected through the Comintern, but I think that apart from this we must also connect the Parties and masses directly, so that the struggles on specific issues and in specific situations can be carried out more effectively against imperialism.

Comrade ROUX (South Africa):

Comrades, I wish to draw the attention of the Congress to the question of the relation between the workers in the imperialist countries and the workers in the colonial countries. Mention was made here of the aristocracy of labour. An aristocracy of labour is a section of the working class, which, by virtue of its advantageous position, shares to a certain extent in the profits of the bourgeoisie. This economic condition is reflected in the reformist outlook of these workers. Thus the extreme reformism of J. H. Thomas, the British railwaymen's leader, is in part an indication that the British railwaymen in the past, and still to a certain extent at the present time, constitute an aristocracy of labour. Simultaneously it can be said that the British working class as a whole stands in the relation of an aristocracy of labour to the oppressed colonial workers and peasants in the colonies and in the countries dominated by British capital.

Are we however to say that the Welsh miner is an aristocrat of labour and a parasite? Of course this is ridiculous. And yet, the unemployed Welsh miner who gets unemployment benefit has a higher income than the employed Indian miner. It is also true that if the British bourgeoisie had no colonial empire to exploit, they would be unable to pay unemployment benefit to the miners. Now we can regard South Africa from this point of view, as a miniature edition of the British Empire. Here we have a white bourgeoisie and a white aristocracy of labour living in the same country together with an exploited colonial working class and also an exploited colonial peasantry. Here the participation of the workers of the ruling race in the

exploitation of the colonial workers is very apparent. Must the Communist Party stress in its propaganda the parasitical nature of the white workers, even the poor and unemployed whites? Must it stress the parasitical nature of the British workers as sharers in the exploitation of the Indians? No. Rather you would say, we should stress the unity of the workers irrespective of colour, in an attack upon capitalism.

The South African Government, in order to solve the poor white problem, has adopted the policy of sacking natives on the railways and putting the poor whites in their places. These workers get only about 5/- a day, a wage on which they say it is impossible to maintain a European standard of living, and yet this wage is twice that of the natives who do the same work. These are some of the problems with which the South African Communist Party is faced.

The organisation of the native workers into trade unions is the chief task of the Communist Party in the present period. At present the main masses of native workers are unorganised. The new native unions growing up on the Witwatersrand contain mostly representatives of the semi-skilled and de-tribalised natives.

The native organisation, the I. C. U., is a loose political party of natives rather than a trade union. It has put forward general wage demands for all natives, but has not organised particular categories of workers, and has conducted scarcely any strikes in its whole existence. In fact its leaders have on more than one occasion acted or functioned as strikebreakers. This function on the part of the leaders of the I. C. U. is due, in part, to its corrupt leadership and its organisational structure. The growing corruption of the I. C. U. leadership has resulted in a split in the union over the question of control of funds by rival leaders. Today the I. C. U. is heavily in debt and has practically ceased to conduct any political or economic struggle. Its membership has fallen by about 75% in the last nine months. On the other hand, since the beginning of 1928, there has been a steady growth of native trade unions on the Witwatersrand, the gold mining area, though not among the gold miners themselves. These unions are under the leadership of the Communist Party and have conducted a number of struggles, most of which have been successful. In the case of the largest of these unions, the native Laundry Workers' Union, an affiliation has been brought about with the white union in the same industry. The latter is affiliated to the white Trade Union Congress and thus the attitude of the white unions in general on the question of native trade unionism has once more been raised.

The expulsion of Communists from the I. C. U. by Kadalie the native leader who "sold out" to the bourgeoisie in 1926, was facilitated by the fact that the Party failed to foresee the expulsion and to make the necessary preparations. The expulsion was facilitated by the character of the native movement, its dependence upon a few big leaders with no lower functionaries among the rank and file, and a complete absence of democracy in the organisation. The officials were all appointed by Kadalie, and the Communist Party failed to play a sufficiently independent role in the I. C. U.

We had very few Negro members at this time, only about 100 in the whole Party. We were afraid of offending the I. C. U. For example, we delayed for months to set up our own Party school while we tried to persuade the I. C. U. to start a school of their own. The same mistake occurred with regard to industrial unions. We merely tried to persuade the I. C. U. to do this work: of course it was not done. We also tried to persuade Kadalie to be more democratic. Even after we were expelled we hesitated about starting new unions, and therefore lost valuable time.

The Communist Party, however, has, during the last year, pursued a much more vigorous policy. By building up native unions and conducting strikes, we spread our influence among the native masses. The number of native Communists is growing rapidly today. This is an indication that if these tactics had been carried through at an earlier stage, the struggle against Kadalie might have been conducted inside the I. C. U., and we should have been in a position to resist our expulsion. The joint strike of white and native workers in Germiston, and

the amalgamation of the native Laundry Workers' Union with the white Laundry Workers' Union which took place last month, constitute important victories on the field of the inter-racial trade union struggle against the employers. These victories must be consolidated and extended on an ever-increasing scale. First, by continuing the work of building up native unions. Secondly, by extending and strengthening our influence in the white unions. In this respect the Communists must take the lead, as they have already done to a certain extent, in the campaign of organising the unorganised white workers, and for the affiliation of the existing white unions to the Trade Union Congress, which at present only contains a quarter of the organised white workers. Thirdly, by continuing the fight for the affiliation of the new native unions to the Trade Union Congress.

Owing to the decline in the I. C. U.'s membership and its split into two sections, the growth of the Communist Party, the growth of native trade unions and the formation of a native Trade Union Federation, the I. C. U. has declined as a factor in the political situation. Nevertheless it still contains large numbers of native workers, especially in the towns, and plays a more or less revolutionary role in certain country districts.

Therefore the Communist Party should adopt towards the I. C. U. the tactics of the united front, and should try to win the I. C. U. rank and file away from the "good-boy" leadership of the I. C. U. and into the Communist Party. In view of the social democratic structure of the I. C. U., an attempt to capture this organisation by permeation is not practicable.

Comrade JACQUEMOTTE (Belgium):

Comrade Ercoli raised in his exposé a very important question in regard to our colonial policy: if colonial policy develops the forces of production in the countries subjected to the mother countries or if it, on the contrary, impedes the development of these forces of production. You know that international Social Democracy answers this question in the affirmative, that it to say, it asserts that capitalism develops the forces of production in the colonial countries. Comrade Ercoli answers the question in the negative, and I think that he is quite right.

However, we have heard this morning from this platform a comrade declaring that in certain countries and in certain cases colonialism develops the forces of production.

I would like to deal with this aspect of the problem in connection with the Belgian Congo, namely the enormous territory in central Africa which was opened fairly recently for capitalist production and which is under Belgian domination; the Congo is 80 times bigger than the mother country.

One of the characteristic features of the post-war period is, in our opinion, the scramble of the capitalists of the mother countries after the colonies. I would like to give you a few facts which will enable you to realise to what extent capitalism has established itself in the Belgian Congo in the last five years, how it exploits the native labour power and what results it achieves.

One can say that before the war the colonial problem was not a very serious problem for the Belgian bourgeoisie. But since the war, agitation on a large scale is carried on, propaganda demonstrations are held everywhere for the development of the colony. Symptomatic demonstrations have taken place and quite recently, after numerous visits to the Congo colony by bourgeois or Social Democratic ministers, even the royal family embarked on a propaganda voyage so as to add weight in the eyes of the population of the mother country to the colonial campaign initiated by the bourgeoisie and the government under the control of the big banks.

One can say that owing to this continuous propaganda the white population has increased considerably in the Congo colony: from 5,926 in 1913 to 18,169 in 1927.

I would like to draw your attention to the characteristic features of the economic situation in the Congo, to the powerful development which has taken place there in the last years, which is, however, not a contradiction of the assertion I made just now that colonial policy does not develop but rather impedes the forces of production.

The chief industries of the Belgian Congo are the extraction of gold, diamonds, silver and copper. The industrial-agricultural plantations are; rubber, palm-oil and palm-nuts.

To make you realise the importance of the industrial development in the last years, I would like to give you a few figures.

The production of copper and cassiterite in 1921 amounted to 31,349 tons and in 1926 to 82,204 tons, which means that the production was trebled.

In regard to diamonds, the increase is much more considerable. In 1921 the production was 157,896 carats, and in 1926 1,114,383 carats.

In regard to gold, the production was 1,359 kilogramms in 1913, 2,228 kilogr. in 1921 and 3,645 kilogr. in 1926, which means that production has trebled since the war.

As to import and export, the same development has taken place. In 1923 import amounted to 330,000 tons and in 1926 to 666,087 tons.

The export amounted to 126,210 tons in 1923 and to 203,678 tons in 1926. In regard to the transport of Negro passengers by the four railway companies of the Congo, we witness the same results, that is to say, a considerable increase.

Naturally, the industrial proletariat, especially the number of Negroes employed in the mines, is increasing considerably. In 1921 31,655 workers were employed in the gold, copper, diamond and coal mines: In 1926 their number in the same enterprises was 61,182.

I would like to draw your attention to one point: the increase of production was much more considerable than the increase of the workers employed in these industries. In the last years a real rationalisation process has taken place, based on the one hand on the development of mechanisation and on the other hand on increased exploitation of the native labour power. Thus in 1921 10,841 Negro workers were employed in the extraction of 157,996 carats of diamonds. In 1926 the extraction of diamonds went up to 1,114,343 carats and the number of workers to 22,264, which means that the number of workers employed in this industry doubled, whereas production increased seven times.

In the other mines, copper and gold, we witness the same results. For instance, a company which extracts cassiterite produced 45 tons in 1921 with 500 Negro workers; in 1926 it produced 167 tons with 170 native workers. Thus, production was quadrupled whereas the number of workers was reduced by two-thirds.

Comrades, in the present period of rapid industrial development the Belgian bourgeoisie, the Belgian exploiters of the Congo are faced by a serious problem which is connected with the question whether colonialism develops the forces of production or not. This powerful development of industry in the Congo, the fact that the colonial companies have been obliged to take away agricultural workers from their villages and to settle tens of thousands of them in camps, has not only disorganised the life of the natives and raised the question of a serious agrarian crisis, as a result of the underfeeding of the Negro population and disorganisation of the entire former life, it has also confronted the colonial companies themselves with the following problem: if we go on as at present, we will kill "the goose which lays the golden eggs", that is to say, Congo colonialism is occupied in exterminating the race and colonial exploiters are seriously and officially considering the necessity of putting a stop for five years to all industrial development in the Belgian Congo.

The government itself proposes to issue decrees forbidding the opening up of new mines and the establishment of new industries. Matters have even come to such a pass that the same kind of solution is considered also for industrial-agricultural production: the production of rubber, palm-oil, etc.

Comrades, in conclusion I would like to deal quite briefly with another aspect of a question which has already been discussed, namely, the position of the Social Democrats in regard to this question.

Comrade Ercoli has already dealt very fully with this problem, and I will not revert to it. He has indicated how in the

sphere of colonial politics the Social Democrats have become loyal and reliable allies of imperialism. But I think that there is yet another aspect of the question which has not been given sufficient prominence. I mean the fact that the support which the Social Democrats give to colonialism, is not only based on a frank betrayal of Socialist principles, but also of the economic interests of Social Democracy. Thus, we find that in Belgium the Social Democratic producers' co-operatives are directly connected with the colonial companies, that producers' co-operative societies such as the textile factories in Ghent which are under Social Democratic control are shareholders of colonial companies for the production of cotton.

In the Kivu committee which was recently established and has secured the concession which is four times as big as Belgium, Social Democratic leaders appear as shareholders.

This aspect of the problem must receive our serious attention, because this direct economic participation of Social Democracy in the exploitation of the colonial peoples produces results which explain at present and will do so in the future, the entire policy of the Social Democrats in regard to the colonial question.

Comrade de VISSER (Holland):

Comrades, the Dutch Delegation is pleased to see that in the theses to Comrade Kuusinen's report there is for the first time a document which deals fully with the problems of the revolution in the colonies and refers to the experiences of the last years. But in these theses as well as in the various reports, no mention is made of a very important part of our colonial policy, namely, the duties and tasks of the proletariat and the Communist Parties in the imperialist countries in regard to the colonies and their liberation struggle.

It is of the utmost importance to make workers in the capitalist countries realise that they must support the revolutionary movement in the colonies because it is in their own interests to see the domination of their own bourgeoisie over the oppressed colonial peoples abolished. It is not enough to assert and point out this in general in our propaganda and agitation. We must be able to demonstrate this concretely and to prove it conclusively in every country in accordance with the historical conditions which prevail there.

I want to draw your attention to the idea expressed by Marx in one of his letters to Engels in 1869 concerning the relation between Great Britain and one of its colonies, namely, Ireland. He says in this letter that apart from all international and human phraseology about "justice for Ireland", it is in the direct interest of the British working class to get rid of its present connection with Ireland. He even adds that he believes now that the British working class will never be able to do anything before it has got rid of Ireland. Is not the substance of our policy in regard to the colonial questions expressed in this and many similar sayings which we meet in the works of Marx and Engels? Colonial domination ties a section of the proletariat of the oppressor nations to "its" bourgeoisie; hereby it divides this working-class and makes it more difficult for it to take up the offensive against the capitalist class and to proceed to revolution and the construction of Socialism. We must be able to explain this to the European workers. We must also persuade them that in the construction of Socialism in their industrial countries they will stand very much in need of the help and the economic support of the revolutionary masses of the colonial countries. Comrades, it is perfectly clear that the food question in countries such as Great Britain, Germany, etc., will play one of the most important roles in the revolution. Therefore, the relation to the world rural district, to quote our programme, to the populous colonial countries which produce raw material and foodstuffs is of decisive importance.

On the other hand, it is only support by the countries where the proletarian dictatorship is introducing Socialism, which enables the colonial countries to develop after the bourgeois-democratic revolution their productive forces without necessarily going through the capitalist stage.

Thus, the rebellious masses in the colonies and the revolutionary proletariat in the mother countries are inter-dependent. These relations which are of enormous importance for our policy, must be fully dealt with in the theses on the colonial question. The same applies also to the tasks which arise therefrom for the Communist Parties in the imperialist countries.

I will deal now with conditions in the Dutch colonies, in Indonesia. There is hardly a colonial country where the bourgeoisie has succeeded to utilise all the resources of the country for its own profit and to impede the independent economic development of the native population to such an extent as in Indonesia and especially in Java. This has been resented by the Javanese people to an ever-increasing extent. In the last century no less than 70 rebellions took place there against Dutch rule.

It is one of the main tasks of our Party to arouse the interest and sympathy of the Dutch working class for this struggle and to lay thereby the foundation for a solid and loyal alliance between the Dutch proletariat and the Indonesian masses. The Communist Party of Holland realises that this is one of the most important spheres of its activity. Even the bourgeois press is compelled to admit that the Communist Party of Holland alone keeps alive the question of the revolution in Indonesia. This was said in connection with the propaganda carried on by our Party at a big colonial exhibition in Arnhem, in parliament, in the press and public meetings.

In this respect we have to struggle first and foremost against the Social-Democrats. Comrade Ercoli has already mentioned that in regard to the colonial question the Dutch Social-Democratic Party has always been the most reactionary and most reformist party. It was for instance a Dutchman, van Kol, who was the first to defend the reformist standpoint in regard to this question at a Congress of the Second International held several years before the World War. At the Brussels Congress, too, the delegation of the Dutch Social Democratic Labour Party took up the most reactionary standpoint and positively refused to recognise Indonesia's right to independence. The attitude of the Social Democrats during the insurrection in Indonesia in 1926 when its spokesman, Stokkisch, advised that the death penalty "should be applied only very cautiously", is well-known.

There is another point which deserves special mention, namely, the economic policy not only of the bourgeoisie, but also of Social Democrats in regard to Indonesia. All bourgeois opposition parties advocate of course various small reforms which keep strictly within the limits of colonial exploitation. Generally speaking, they set their hopes on the birth of capitalist elements within the Indonesian population itself in whom the Dutch bourgeoisie and also the Social-Democrats see a prop and pillar for their regime of economic and political oppression and exploitation.

In Europe Holland is probably the country with the most highly developed labour aristocracy. In accordance with this is the entire policy of the Dutch Social Democrats which is based on the temporary interests of the upper stratum of the proletariat and the corrupt trade union and Party bureaucrats. Against such an array of forces the struggle of our Party is by no means easy, and it is of course made still more difficult owing to the criminal split attempts of politicians such as Wynkoop, the renegade who by his efforts to divide the revolutionary workers of Holland, is greatly impeding the struggle for the independence of Indonesia.

Against all Social-Democratic attempts to avoid clarity in regard to this question, we are setting our slogan "Indonesia free from Holland — now". We must struggle against the attempts of the Dutch bourgeoisie and Social-Democracy to deceive the Indonesian masses with pseudo-reforms of the type of a peoples' council and such-like measures. The mass of the Indonesian population, the oppressed and exploited small peasantry and the enslaved proletariat can lessen their burdens and pave the way for further development only through the bourgeois-democratic revolution and through the dictatorship of the workers and peasants. The Dutch proletariat cannot achieve the Socialist Revolution unless it allies itself with the Indonesian

masses. Just as work for the liberation of Indonesia is one of our most important tasks, contact with the Dutch workers and propaganda among them for the cause of Indonesia is a very important part of the work of our Indonesian brother Party.

To create and strengthen the alliance between the enslaved masses of Indonesia and the revolutionary workers of Holland, — such is the most important task of our two Parties, as a component part of the great strategical plan of the Communist International, the grand idea of Lenin!

Comrade GOMEZ (U. S. A.):

The guiding principle governing our approach to the colonial question is the essential unity between the revolutionary movements in the oppressed countries and the process of the proletarian world revolution. I wish to say a few words on the struggle against **American Imperialism**, from the standpoint of general strategy on an empire scale.

This requires first of all an understanding of the world role of American Imperialism, of its striving toward world hegemony and of the central feature of its policy, which is that it is a war policy. At the time of the **Nanking Massacre** the majority of our Party's political committee based its activities on the theory that the United States was Great Britain's "catpaw" in China; and only a few months ago (in its statements on the **Tsinan incident**) it declared that the United States was the tail-end to Japanese imperialism! These comrades picture American imperialism in the Far East as **playing no independent aggressive role**, being used now by British, now by Japanese imperialism, for their own brutal ends. Comrade Wolfe defended the "catpaw theory" before our Party plenum on the ground that the United States is still guided primarily by the old democratic-pacifist Open Door policy in China. He quoted statistics to show that American capitalism had very little capital invested in China and was interested in China only as a market for commodities. Comrade Wolfe and Comrade Lovestone refuse to see that in the present period **even the question of markets** is bound up with monopoly policy and domination of market areas.

British and American imperialism are the outstanding antagonists of the capitalist world. Antagonism between American and Japanese imperialism is no less sharp. Under these circumstances to indulge in such burlesque explanations of U. S. policy as our Polcom majority has done means not only to confuse the workers, not only to shirk the direct campaign against American imperialism, but might even help to create a receptive attitude among some workers for chauvinist ideas.

Within a few hundred miles from Canton are the **Philippine Islands**, America's largest colony. The dominant party in the Philippines is the so-called Nationalist Party which represents the thoroughly corrupted national bourgeoisie. It disguises its betrayal of the **struggle for Philippine independence** by empty appeals for favours from Washington. The task in the Philippines is to build a new, **revolutionary**, movement based upon the masses of workers and poor peasants; to orientate it away from appeals to Washington and towards contact with the revolutionary movement in China, as well as with the Indonesian movement. The first task, however, is the formation of a Communist cadre. **The American Party must send representatives to the Philippine Islands for this work without further loss of time.** Absolutely no effort has been made by our Political Committee to do this, despite specific instructions from the Comintern.

The strategy of the struggle against American imperialism is obliged to concern itself most particularly with the problem of destroying the primary base of American imperialism, Latin America, and of converting it into a base against imperialism.

The anti-imperialist struggle in Latin America will go forward under the slogan of the **United Latin-American anti-imperialist front**. It would be ridiculous to believe that Latin-American unity is possible in the sense of a federation of the existing states. Nevertheless, we must issue the slogan of a union of Latin-American countries against imperialism, and we must denounce bourgeois opposition to unity as sabotage of the anti-imperialist united front.

Comrade Banderas does not like all this "Latin-Americanism". He is afraid: 1. that the petty bourgeoisie may make use of it to dominate the movement; 2. that it may make the Latin-American masses turn away from the idea of unity with the workers in the United States. Well, I have no such fears.

Comrade Banderas will not find the Latin-American petty bourgeoisie so willing to fight for the union of the Latin-American countries and neither will he find the revolutionary elements in Latin America so antagonistic to alliance with the class-conscious workers in the United States. They will, and do, look with hostility upon the bureaucracy of the American Federation of Labour, but that is quite another matter. By all means unity between the Latin American movement and the revolutionary proletariat in the U. S. Nevertheless it was correct for the Profintern to approve the launching of a Latin-American Federation of Labour.

Comrade Humbert Droz has indicated the general relation of class forces in the revolutionary movements throughout Latin America. We must be able to find the point of intersection of all these diverse movements, which differ widely from country to country, and unite them in a **common movement** under our leadership, together with the revolutionary proletarian movement in the United States. The form of the All-America Anti-Imperialist League is well suited to this purpose. Other subsidiary unifying forms for the struggle on a continental scale must also be developed.

Considering further the question of strategy in Latin America we must bear in mind the special position of the **Caribbean area**. We should send special forces into this region. Above all we should make it possible for the Mexican comrades to directly assist the development of Communist cadres there.

The war of American imperialism in **Nicaragua** is expressive of the whole aggressive drive of American imperialism against Latin America. In all Latin American countries support to the Nicaraguan struggle must be the focus of our anti-imperialist campaign. In the five countries making up the historical Central American nation (whose unity has been repeatedly thwarted by the manoeuvres of American imperialism) the war against Nicaragua must be denounced as a final blow at Central American national unity.

Speaking of **Mexico** I agree with Comrade Banderas that the Mexican Revolution cannot be regarded as having ended, notwithstanding the desertion of the bourgeoisie, so long as the agrarian revolution is incompleting, and large numbers of peasants are armed. Comrade Humbert Droz stated that our Mexican comrades made mistakes in the past with regard to their attitude towards the Mexican government. I wish to point out that since the murder of Obregon there are signs of a recurrence of these mistakes, in a totally changed situation which would make them far more dangerous.

Many reasons combine to make Mexico the traditional territorial centre of Latin American resistance to American imperialism, and it is in Mexico that the centre of our anti-imperialist movement throughout the Americas must be established. The present centre should be strengthened with the help of the Comintern along the lines of a proposal which is being submitted.

Before concluding I wish to set down the points of strategy for the work of our own Party in the United States, as follows:

1. Draw American workers into the general anti-imperialist struggle **through, and in connection with, the struggle against the War Danger.**

2. Win the semi-awakened masses away from pacifist leadership through pitiless exposure of pacifism and the Pacifists and Socialists as a prop of capitalist state power and war preparations.

3. Lead American workers along the line of active co-operation with the colonial and semi-colonial masses **on the basis of the international ramifications of trusted American capitalism** and the day-to-day requirements of the proletarian class struggle against it.

4. Link up the struggle of the Negroes as an oppressed minority in the United States with anti-imperialist struggles in Haiti, Santo Domingo, etc. **This includes propagation of the right of self-determination for the Negroes in the United States.**

5. Combine work in the military and naval forces with the activities among the broad masses.

6. Draw in non-proletarian elements (farmers and urban petty bourgeoisie) as allies in the workers' anti-imperialist movement under our influence.

7. Establish close contact with the Latin-Americans, Filipinos, Chinese, etc., in the United States, on the basis of their interests as especially oppressed workers in the U. S. as well as on the basis of the struggle in their home countries.

Our Party has been criticised here for inactivity with regard to the Nicaraguan war and for insufficient anti-imperialist work generally. **This criticism is fully justified.** The roots of this lie very deep and are connected with the same circumstances as those responsible for the Party's failure to do any serious work among Negroes. Everything accomplished has been without the support and against the resistance of the majority of the Political Committee. The Lovestone Group has attempted to maintain here that the Party would have done excellent anti-imperialist work if it were only not for the head of the anti-imperialist department. And yet they do not cite one wrong policy of ours. All they are able to find is a single isolated slogan, out of the hundreds of wrong slogans that our Party has put forward in its various fields of activity. Comrade Wolfe has repeated here the charge that there was created a special petty-bourgeois Red Cross organisation in the Nicaraguan campaign. This is an absolute lie, as every member of our Political Committee knows.

The truth is that the majority of our Political Committee underestimates anti-imperialist work, underestimates Negro work, underestimates our responsibility to the colonial and semi-colonial movements, underestimates the War Danger. The Lovestone group members do not attend meetings of the anti-imperialist committee. Anti-imperialist work has not even been made a point on the agenda at a single Party convention or Party plenum since the Lovestone Group came to power. Comrade Lovestone has had the nerve to boast of anti-militarist work, when the Party did not send a single man to work among the troops in Nicaragua, or in China either.

Can we organise an empire-wide strategy for the struggle against American imperialism? Only if our Party in the United States understands that it must show the way.

Comrade BENNET (Great Britain):

It is difficult in one speech to touch upon all the problems of the colonial world which is the majority of mankind. I would like to concentrate only on two questions, on the Indian question and on the Negro question.

You will remember, of course, that Comrade Kuusinen in his speech gave quite a big part of his attention to the Indian problem, — for the simple reason that the Indian problem is the most difficult and the most complicated, at the very same time, the most urgent colonial problem.

Now, with the consent of Comrade Kuusinen, I will try to formulate my disagreement with the theses in the sharpest way possible. Comrade Kuusinen speaks about classical capitalism and its policy towards the colonies. I am afraid that Comrade Kuusinen had in mind more the end of the last century when he described capitalism in its policy towards the colonies. He speaks about the old colonial and semi-colonial world as an agrarian appendage of the imperialist capitalist world. It is enough just to glance at present-day India to see that there is some contradiction with the theses. Can you consider present-day India just as an agrarian or agricultural appendage, let us say, to the British Empire? In another place, Comrade Kuusinen formulates it still sharper. He says "that the colonies in their relations to the so-called 'mother-

lands' are always transformed into an agrarian hinterland for the industrial city, an agricultural appendage to the vastly bloated body of the capitalist big industries".

Now, when you remember that we are discussing these theses and the Indian problem at a time when we are witnessing great industrial unrest in India, when we witness the great lasting and stubborn strikes in which tens of thousands of workers are participating, you will agree with me that to speak about this as village or agrarian appendage is at least a big mistake.

It is true that Comrade Kuusinen mentions some "deviations" from this trend of imperialist colonial policy. He sees the deviations in the participation of imperialist countries through export of finance capital in the industries of the colonies and semi-colonies. Well, comrades, the word deviation is very popular in our ranks here but I think that to say that the colonial policy based upon the export of capital is a deviation from real and classical imperialism, means to imply that imperialism itself is a deviation from capitalism. It is not a question of deviations. We are simply faced with a complicated colonial and semi-colonial world where different policies are intermingled and if you want to speak about a new policy, you will be bound to emphasise exactly this policy which Comrade Kuusinen calls a deviation. This is not a deviation but a new stage of imperialist colonial policy which is in full harmony with the general policy of imperialism.

Is the question of industrialisation, or the question of the participation of the imperialist powers in the industrialisation of the colonies an academical question or a political question? I personally believe it is a political question. If you come to the conclusion that India is a great village, that India is an agrarian appendage to British imperialism, then obviously you must oversee the great class struggles which are taking place in India, you must under-estimate the role and the importance of the working class. You must have a misconception about the role of the bourgeoisie; you are bound not to see the forces making for the transformation of the bourgeois democratic revolution into the socialist revolution. The problem of industrialisation is a problem which is directly linked up with the question of the perspectives of the development of the revolutionary movement in India.

Another question which was introduced in this discussion is about the participation of British imperialism in the industrialisation of India. Personally, I am convinced that this problem is of secondary importance; whether Britain participates actively or does not participate actively does not change the situation. Still, comrades, the very fact that Comrade Kuusinen insists that British imperialism does not participate, that British imperialism comes back to the old policy, makes it imperative for me to dwell a little bit on this question also. Kuusinen's opinion on the question of the policy British imperialism is directly linked up with the question of the development of industrialisation in India itself. Everyone who listens to Comrade Kuusinen must think: on the one hand the whole colonial world is an agrarian appendage; on the other hand Great Britain is doing and will do whatever possible to retard, to prevent the industrialisation of India. Under such circumstances there is no future for any development of sharp class struggles, there is no basis for the proletarianisation, the place of the proletarian masses will be taken by the pauperised masses. In other words, we will have a big peasant movement which must in certain circumstances be led by the Indian bourgeoisie. That is why, comrades, I believe that we must answer the arguments of Comrade Kuusinen also on the question of the part Britain plays in the industrialisation of India. On this question two different opinions were presented in the Communist literature:

1. Comrade Varga believes that British participation in the industrialisation of India was due to four reasons: a) political reasons, the necessity of getting the support of the Indian bourgeoisie; b) military reasons, to secure war industrial supplies; c) economic reasons, the importance of supplying the Indian market with British made goods; and, finally, the fourth reason; d) general war propagandist purposes, the necessity of some liberal gestures to obtain the support of the oppressed nationalities.

Do these four reasons presented by Comrade Varga completely disappear, or do they continue to work? Let us take the question of military supplies. In our previous discussion we all agreed that we have entered into a period of preparations for a new war which will be much greater than the last war. In the coming war the East will play a bigger part even than in the last one and especially India. Now, comrades, if the industrialisation of India was needed for military purposes in the previous years, it is still more needed at the present time. Present military supplies require such a great technical basis that as a matter of fact it needs a tremendous amount of different branches of industry.

But among the reasons put forward by Varga, even the political reason also did not disappear as yet. Take Varga's first reason, — the necessity of getting the support of the Indian bourgeoisie. If Great Britain is preparing for a great war, if Great Britain will need India, then it will need not only the war supplies of India, but it will need also public opinion. Obviously, if Comrade Kuusinen believes that it is easy to dismiss Varga's reasons, it was his duty to show us how he dismissed it.

I am in disagreement with Varga. I do not believe that the reasons he has put forward are the most convincing.

The other opinion on this question was presented by Comrade Ragi Dutt. Dutt says that Great Britain cannot stop the inevitable process of industrialisation and for that reason it has recourse to a skillful volte-face, by taking the industrialisation into its own hands in order to turn it to the profit of British capital. Here you have a clearer explanation of the fact put in a real deep Marxist manner. Industrialisation in India is a fact, the British imperialists must take this development into consideration. The question is not about colonisation or decolonisation; the question is about the carrying through of industrialisation of India under the control of Great Britain. Great Britain understands perfectly well that if she will not take into her hands industrialisation, other powers will. That means that in an economic fight Great Britain will lose her grip upon India. Marx wrote about India:

"Once machinery is introduced into the communication system of a land possessing coal and iron, it is impossible to hold it back from its own development. The railway system in India is in fact the forerunner of modern industry."

(Letters of Karl Marx, written in 1853 and printed in the "New York Tribune".)

Of course, comrades, it would be a great mistake to say that Great Britain is participating in the industrialisation of India for the sake of the development of the productive forces of India. Great Britain has its own interests. Obviously its participation in the industrialisation does not give the full development of productive forces, it may even retard the development of the more important branches of industry. But still, as a matter of fact, to say that Great Britain is going back to the old policy of the 19th century would be a great mistake.

Now one word about the famous bogey, decolonisation. In the theses presented by Comrade Kuusinen, paragraph 8, it is stated

"that all the talk of the imperialists and their lackeys about the decolonisation policy of the imperialist powers towards their colonies is nothing less than an imperialist lie".

You will remember that Comrade Kuusinen in his speech quoted also several comrades who spoke about "decolonisation". Those, who used this word, rightly or wrongly, did so with the sole object of emphasising the industrialisation of India which is changing the relation of forces in this country. I am prepared also to become a target for any possible attacks, yet I prefer to speak about "decolonisation" rather than to join in the description of India as a village hinterland of the British Empire. It is true that the lackeys of capitalism also speak about decolonisation. The difference is this: that while the social reformists are anxious to glorify imperialism, the aim of our comrades was to show the new forces and the new ways of development of the national revolutionary movement in India which makes for the transformation of the bourgeois democratic revolution into the social revolution. It must be added that decolo-

nisation was used by all our comrades in quotation marks and is in no way described as a policy of imperialist powers to their colonies.

I would ask comrades to think over very carefully paragraph 20 of the theses. There it is stated:

"It is not excluded that the reformist bourgeoisie in a colony may be driven by the logic of the struggle, especially in an acute revolutionary situation, to give up to some extent its policy of pendulating between the imperialist and nationalist revolutionary camps."

Now think over this idea. Now, is there any other possibility except one, namely, that the vast majority of the big national bourgeoisie of India at the first moment of the beginning of a new revolutionary wave will join hands with the imperialists against the national revolution? I have no doubts whatsoever, and there cannot be any doubts about it. A big part of this bourgeoisie is already acting in a coalition with British imperialism.

Comrades, to speak about India and not to mention the Bardoli decision, is exactly the same as to speak about Russia, let us say in 1916 without mentioning the experience of 1905. It was a real experience of all classes of India; they all have shown their faces. Millions of men have participated in that great struggle, and this magnificent struggle was betrayed through a proclamation, which is really a declaration of principles. In order to make the declaration clear to you, I will first remind you what happened. We witnessed there a great development of the national movement which penetrated into the villages. The peasants took an active part in the movement, they were faced with the forces of British imperialism, and they used force against force. Now listen carefully, comrades, to every word in this decision:

"The working committee deplores the inhuman conduct of the mob at Chauri Chaura in having brutally murdered constables and wantonly burned police thana (station).

In view of the violent outbreaks every time mass civil disobedience is inaugurated, indicating that the country is not violent enough, the Working Committee of the Congress resolves that mass civil disobedience . . . be suspended, and instructs the local Congress Committee to advise the cultivators to pay land revenue and other taxes due to the government, and to suspend every other activity of an offensive character.

The Working Committee advises Congress workers and organisations to inform the ryots (peasants) that withholding of rent payment to the zemindars (landlords) is contrary to the Congress resolutions and injurious to the best interests of the country.

The Working Committee assures the zemindars that the Congress movement is in no way intended to attack their legal rights and that even where the ryots have grievances, the committee desires that redress be sought by mutual consultation and arbitration."

This was the great betrayal which brought to an end that magnificent movement. This experience deserves our attention. It will play some role in the further development of the Indian revolutionary movement.

The experience of the Chinese revolution also exists not only for us but also for our enemies, and especially for the bourgeoisie in India.

On the basis of their own experience, the Indian bourgeoisie know that the development of the revolutionary movement in India means the beginning of an agrarian revolution; that it is the beginning of the struggle of the workers and peasants for power. Armed with these two experiences, will the bourgeoisie really vacillate between the imperialists and the national revolution? The national bourgeoisie in India will never hesitate, they are acting already in the counter-revolutionary direction. Everyone who speaks about any shadow of a possibility of the national bourgeoisie playing any positive active part in the national revolution is spreading illusions. Such ideas are disarming the workers of India. Such ideas cannot find place in our theses.

To make it quite clear that this is not an accidental remark, I will ask you to read still more carefully point 23. There it is said:

"In this stage it would be an ultra-Left mistake to start the Communist Party agitation by simply identifying the national-reformists (Swarajists, Wafidists and others) with the ruling counter-revolutionary bloc of imperialists and feudal lords."

Well, comrades, I am prepared to go ahead and to be declared an ultra-Leftist today, and to say that the Communist Party will have no possibility and no need to identify them. They will identify themselves — they will work together. To think that at the preparatory period of real revolutionary movement we must still be afraid to brand the Swaraj Party as a counter-revolutionary party means simply not to understand what the Swaraj Party is. It is a bourgeois counter-revolutionary party, organised to prevent the nationalist movement from becoming a revolutionary movement, and after all preventative measures have shown to be futile to suppress the movement by forces.

The Swaraj Party has never denied it. The Swaraj Party always said clearly what it is organised for, and today, comrades, a member of our Presidium, in the Indian Commission said that Das, the leader of the Swaraj Party, greeted Mussolini, the Fascist leader, and added that the only thing which Soviet Russia needs now is a good Fascist revolution. But I know another statement of Das which describes the situation sufficiently clearly.

On August 31st, 1924, C.R. Das wrote in his organ "Forward":

"There is a more serious anarchist movement than the authorities realise. It is growing, and it is increasingly difficult to suppress it. I hope the British and Indians will get together and come to terms on the lines I have mentioned. If the Swarajist movement fails, no repression can possibly cope with the anarchy which is sure to raise its head."

The Indian workers are warned even in the period of a new revolutionary movement, to be very careful not to mix up this wonderful revolutionary Swaraj Party with other counter-revolutionary scoundrels.

But even point 23 is not an isolated point. In Chapter 25 we have the same idea: the possibility for the bourgeoisie to actively participate in the revolutionary movement and even objectively to play a revolutionary role.

Now comrades, does it mean that I am prepared to defend the opinion that there are no contradictions between the Indian bourgeoisie and British imperialists? Nothing of the kind! — I spoke already of the ways and methods of British participation in Indian industrialisation. Obviously there are great conflicts between them. These conflicts may play a big part in the development of the revolutionary movement. As a result of these conflicts certain parts of the bourgeoisie may and will play a certain oppositional role. They will try to get more concessions, better positions and better understanding, according to the line on which Das spoke, but while the bourgeoisie in peaceful times presents an opposition to imperialism, the same bourgeoisie plays a fully counter-revolutionary role concerning the national revolutionary movement. There is no possibility of a compromise between the bourgeoisie and the national revolutionary movement. There are plenty of possibilities of a real good understanding between this oppositional bourgeoisie and British imperialism, while there is no possibility of a compromise between the bourgeoisie and the national revolutionary movement.

My proposals are: 1. to redraft the second chapter, to give an explanation not only of the colonial policy of the 19th century but also of the colonial policy of the 20th century; to treat the export of capital and imperialist participation in industries of definite colonies and semi-colonies, to underline how the gold of the exported capital is transformed into iron rings for the oppressed peoples.

2. To give a full description of the past of the Indian revolution in order to make clear the probability of the counter-

revolutionary role of the bourgeoisie in India without denying the fact that this bourgeoisie plays a certain role of an opposition.

3. To make perfectly clear the industrial side of Indian life, the great class contradictions which will help us to extend the role of the proletariat on the one hand, and the role of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie on the other. These are the necessary changes, in my opinion, which must be made in the resolution concerning India. Of course these changes concern the description of the general colonial policy as well.

I had in mind, comrades, to tell you a little about the work of the Negro Sub-commission. There are in the world two great black belts, one black belt in Africa which comprises tens of millions of slaves who are subjected to the most brutal oppression. On the other hand, we have a small black belt in the country of high civilisation, in the South of U. S. A.

Firstly, something must be said in the colonial theses on this question.

We cannot have general colonial theses of the Congress without answering this Negro problem in one way or another. Secondly, I believe that the Congress must pay special attention to the Negroes in the U. S. A. Our commission believes that the time is ripe, not only to begin a sharper fight for the Negro race in the U. S. A., not only to intensify the fight against white chauvinism, not only to turn the attention of our American Party to the Negro question, but to change to some degree the programme of the American Party on this question. We believe that the American Party must come out openly and unreservedly for the right of national self-determination to the point of separation and the organisation of a separate state of the Negroes in the South. We think this would mean also a new line in our activities and will have a great impetus to the Negro population, for the general fight against imperialism and for the fight for national freedom.

As to South Africa, I believe we are faced with such a situation that while our South African Party is the only Party which has succeeded in getting into the Party a great number of Negro workers, yet this Party until today has not a clear Leninist point of view on the Negro problem. Several months ago we recommended our South African Comrades to come out with a concrete slogan of a native republic in South Africa. The answer of our South African comrades was that the slogan is wrong, unnecessary, and disastrous. We thought that the line of the Party is wrong, so wrong that it became disastrous, and that it became necessary to introduce certain corrections.

In conclusion, a question to Comrade Kuusinen, with regards to China. Comrade Kuusinen insists in his theses, that on the whole, our line concerning the Kuomintang was a correct one. I know that many Chinese comrades were opposed to the affiliation or to the entrance into the ranks of the Kuomintang Party. You also know that the Comintern recommended the entrance and it was carried. Now, I want to find out whether in our literature, in our instructions, was it made sufficiently clear to the comrades, to the Communists in China, that while entering the Kuomintang they should consider this organisation not only as a probable, but as an inevitable enemy of the future? When Comrade Lenin recommended the British comrades to affiliate to the Labour Party, he said this will give you a bridge to the masses although you must know that Henderson is just as bad and may be even worse than Noske. Our recommendation to join the Labour Party was accompanied by a certain amount of warning about the objective role of this organisation which the comrades were called upon to join.

I put this question because I think that it is of a big political importance. It is necessary to have a clarification of this question in order to know whether we are sharing some responsibility for the fact that the Chinese Communists were not sufficiently prepared ideologically for that moment when the betrayal took place. If the answer of Comrade Kuusinen will be that we have not done enough, then my proposal will be to have it said in the theses.

Comrade MIKHA TZKHAKAI (Georgian Soviet Republic):

I want to deal briefly here with the question as to why there is not and cannot be a colonial problem in the U. S. S. R.

The Tsarist bourgeoisie and landlords together with the foreign capitalists pursued their imperialist policy on an international scale, a real colonial policy within the country in relation to its various parts, various peoples inhabiting the Russian Empire. The Far East, Middle East, Central Caucasia as a whole and Transcaucasia in particular were all objects of this colonial policy. Primitive and plunderous methods of production prevailed in the oil district of Baku, the manganese and coal mines of Transcaucasia, the coal mines of Donetz Basin, and the mines of Ural. The ruling classes exploited the masses without employing any of the modern achievements of science and technique. They derived super-profits from the exploitation of the cheap labour power of the districts which were their colonies. In a way Tsarist Russia was to a certain extent itself a colony of international capitalism. Russia expanded her colonies towards the Far East and the Near East making use of the lessons acquired from the West-European imperialists, especially from Great Britain and France.

The October Revolution put a stop to this situation. The centre of violence became the centre of a powerful liberation movement and the germinator of world revolution. The places which were formerly oppressed now constitute tens of independent and autonomous Socialist Soviet Republics which are developing their industry and agriculture in the towns and villages inhabited by the working classes which have taken a determined course of industrialisation of the whole of national economy. In those Republics we can see now the construction of factories and mills and there is not a sign left there of any interference with the growth of their industries. In such a country, comrades, a country which has such a political and genuinely Socialist governmental structure there can be no colonial problem. The most backward peoples which were unknown in history before and which were at a very low level of economic development are now being organised into autonomous Soviet Republics. We have tens of such Republics in the U. S. S. R. In spite of the greatest hardships, Bolshevism under Leninist leadership was able to guide these economically backward peoples onto the path of a Socialist and Soviet construction.

In solving the colonial problem which is of tremendous importance and affects the fate of 1000 million people inhabiting our globe, we must take into account the experience of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Some ten or eleven years ago the border lands of Tsarist Russia were ruled by the Tsarist knout and were economically stagnant. This is now all changed. Notwithstanding our limited means, notwithstanding the difficult international situation, the U. S. S. R. was able to guarantee a sufficiently broad development of industry to all these former colonies in Transcaucasia as, for instance, Azerbaidjan, Georgia and Armenia.

The main prerequisite for this development was an alliance between the toiling sections of town and country under the leadership of the proletariat.

We will take as an example, let us say, such a town as Elizavetpol, now Gandzha, the second largest town after Baku, in the independent Soviet Republic of Azerbaidjan. Formerly, some governor sent from Petersburg ruled the town. The only thing that prospered there was vineyards. Now we can find well-equipped mills and factories in the town. It is characteristic that the industries developing there are known even in America and Western Europe as new industries. Lenin spoke of the significance of the agrarian and cultural revolution in the rural areas. The achievements of the remote town of Elizavetpol show how this is being carried out. The town has now become the second industrial centre of the independent Socialist Soviet Republic of Azerbaidjan which is part of the Transcaucasian Federation affiliated with our great Soviet Union. The same is true of all our Republics, all other parts of the Soviet Union, and particularly Transcaucasia. The country is making rapid strides forward.

We must study closely what is happening in our country, and especially so the comrades who have to deal with colonies, metropolis, opportunists, traitors, Mencheviks and pseudo-Marxians. By our example we must show how the well-being

of the former colonies of Russia, which are now autonomous Socialist Soviet Republics, is growing. The Communist Parties of the imperialist and the colonial countries must make more ample use of our experiences. It seems to me that in their propaganda and agitation the comrades must utilise more than they have been doing the experience and the great work accomplished by the peoples inhabiting the Soviet Union. This is especially true in connection with the mobilisation of the masses and the spreading of our influence among the peasantry and in our practical day to day work in the colonies.

Comrade ROTHSTEIN (Great Britain):

Comrades, I want to continue the criticism of the theses on the lines which Comrade Bennett made. I will deal more particularly with the second section, because I consider that this section of the theses strikes the note which dominates the whole of its succeeding sections, and because the fundamental errors which I consider show themselves in this section, show themselves in the practical application of the line which is struck at the beginning. To say, for example, that in the colonies the capitalist enterprises cultivated by imperialism are "predominantly almost exclusively, of an agrarian capitalist sort, with the exception of a few workshops established for possible military needs", is simply a travesty of the actual situation, if we take India, South Africa, if we take even the plans that are already in existence for textile factories in Egypt, not to mention other parts of the biggest Empire with which this Congress has to deal.

I wish further to draw attention to the exaggeration in the sentence in paragraph 6 of the theses, which speaks of the "transformation" of the colonies into producers of cheap food stuffs and raw materials for the developed capitalist countries. I contend, comrades, that this was a correct picture of the utilisation of the colonies in the first stages of modern capitalist development. But to give this picture in the era of imperialism, of the export of capital, of the growth of huge international monopolies, and above all, in the era of the industrialisation of those countries which were the principal sources of raw materials in the pre-imperialist era is, it seems to me, a complete travesty, and leads to a fundamentally incorrect conclusion. The summing up of the incorrect facts into a thesis, which lays the foundation for all the incorrect developments later on in this statement before us, occurs in the same paragraph, where it speaks of the tendency of the big imperialist powers to "adapt their monopolised colonies more and more exclusively to the requirements of their own industries".

Now, if there is one feature of the era of finance capital, of the export of capital, of the opening up of the colonies, of which Lenin spoke and described in such wealth of detail in his book on Imperialism, it is that the monopolised colonies do not become exclusively adapted to the requirements of their own industries in the sense of being simply sources of raw material and of cheap labour power, but that they become fields of investment in the search for higher profits. The bourgeoisie exports capital with the object of stimulating the basic industries in the home countries, and thereby transforms these colonial countries into fields for producing the means of production in their turn. Thereby the bourgeoisie objectively carries out a process of industrialisation, which does not adapt these colonies to the requirements of the home countries of the imperialists, but on the contrary, as we see most classically in the example of Great Britain, transforming them into serious competitors in the first place and finally into sources of stagnation, of degeneration, of parasitism, for the metropolitan countries.

It is a peculiar thing, that after the picture of this sharp division of the world between the industrial imperialists and the agrarian hinterland of the colonies, we find mention in the theses again and again of economic and social counter-forces which this process has called forth. We find mention further on of the "resistance power of the dependent country" which suddenly makes its appearance. We find reference later on to the struggle between the imperialists and the native bourgeoisie. We find the proletariat, for example, in the paragraph on the Chinese revolution, appearing on the scene as "for the first time able to play an independent role", when the whole picture which was drawn in the earlier part of this section, leads one to expect that the proletariat, so far from developing into

a powerful counter-force is, on the contrary, reduced to greater and greater weakness. There is a contradiction which these theses are built upon, it seems to me, thanks to their purely eclectic line of thought and the eclecticism in this first part of the theses is something that runs right through.

In particular I would draw attention to paragraph 7, which speaks of "deviations" from the general trend of imperialist colonial policy, "due to the interest of financial capital in exporting capital, especially if the machine building industries of the Metropolis feel acutely the restriction of their export market."

Now to have certain "deviations" alluded to as springing from the "interest" of finance capital, as though finance capital is one of the many elements in imperialism, an element on a par with other elements, something that has not got a specific weight of its own, that does not determine the whole trend of the development of capitalism in its latest phase — this seems to me to be a complete departure from the method of analysis of finance capital, of imperialism, which Comrade Lenin gave us. I consider all this too, is an illustration of the wrong eclectic method that is adopted in building up these theses; that the domination of finance capital is not taken as the main feature of the era of imperialism. And the consequences that flow from the development of capitalism into the era of finance capital, of monopolist capital, of imperialism — these consequences are not taken as a dominating phase of the imperialist epoch, but are taken as something which may be mentioned, which merely may introduce certain corrections. Therefore they completely lose their proper weight in the whole picture.

I want to point out, in conclusion, certain results that this eclectic method leads to. I have already mentioned the sentence which says that the "dependent country develops a resistance power". Where this resistance power has come from, where the bourgeoisie has sprung from, — all this is left a mystery, and is just put into the theses, side by side with a statement that leads to totally different conclusions.

Further on, in paragraph 7, we have a statement that "unless forced to by circumstances, imperialism never makes real lasting concessions to colonies or semi-colonies..." "Unless forced to by circumstances!" Surely it is just when we begin to consider what are these circumstances, that we begin to find that the interest of finance capital in exporting capital (which was previously just dropped in almost as an accident, causing certain deviations) becomes a decisive feature. It is not sufficient for these theses to refer to mysterious "circumstances" and thereby, instead of giving a clear dialectical picture of the development of the contradictions within imperialism, to leave us with a purely eclectic hash of facts and conclusions that are based on one line of reasoning, mixed up with conclusions based on a totally different line of reasoning, without any attempt to unify the two.

I want to refer also to paragraph 9, which gives a short historical summary of the counter-revolutionary struggle of the imperialist governments against the liberation movements of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples after the world war.

For example, we find here the statement that British imperialism first waged a war for the subjection of Afghanistan, but the Afghans, a small and undeveloped people, courageously defended their independence, and afterwards forced the British Government to recognise it.

The actual fact is that it was the Afghan king, Amanullah who rose in revolt against the puppet of British imperialism in Afghanistan, as part of the general revolt of the colonial peoples against British Imperialism after the war. It was not the British who declared war on him. He carried the war into India, he managed to rouse a certain ferment and a certain amount of trouble behind the British lines, with the result that the British were forced to give way. But that true picture, which depends upon our understanding of the general wave of colonial revolt which was hastened by the war, — this picture has here to be completely destroyed in order to justify the incorrect approach in this passage of the theses.

Similarly, instead of having the picture of Angora revolting after the war against the control of Turkey by finance capital, we have stress laid upon the occupation of Constantinople by the British as the characteristic feature of this post-war struggle between imperialism and the colonial peoples. When the actual facts are exactly the reverse! When the actual picture should be the revolt of Angora, the revolt of the Turkish bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie, supported by the peasantry, against the exploitation of Turkey by foreign finance capital through the Sultanate, stimulated to no inconsiderable degree by the economic developments which finance capital produced in Turkey itself.

Similarly with the question of Persia. The revolt of Reza Khan, the consolidation of a strong military force, the driving out of the Kajar dynasty, disappear, and we have a general phrase that in Persia the national forces become stronger, and Great Britain in 1924 organised a rising against it.

These inconsistencies and these departures from historic facts, comrades, I contend, are not accidental. Such a presentation of events is bound up organically with the wrong conceptions that are contained in the basic part of these theses. And I repeat that this section on the tendencies of imperialist colonial policy strikes the keynote for the whole of the theses, insofar as its facts, its historical analysis are incorrect, its picture of what is going on actually in the biggest colonial countries today are incorrect, and insofar as its method is incorrect, being fundamentally eclectic instead of dialectic. I consider this section must be completely and radically revised, and the necessary alterations made in the subsequent sections which develop the thesis contained in section 2.

Thirty-fourth Session.

Moscow, 17th August 1928 (Morning).

Chairman: Comrade Chitarov (Y. C. I.):

Comrade MAUAWAR (Indonesia):

Comrades, the Communist insurrection in Indonesia at the end of 1926 and in the beginning of 1927 did not come like a flash of lightning in a clear sky, but it was well-prepared. It can be said that the general strike of the metal workers of Surabaya in December 1925 was the commencement of the insurrection.

At the end of 1925 the Communist Party of Indonesia had reached its height of development and its influence was very predominant among the working class and peasantry. On the other hand, the terror and the black reaction practised by the Dutch imperialists had also reached its culminating point. The Dutch Government knew very well that at that time the Communist influence among the masses could be exterminated only by means of force. Day after day the provocations of the im-

perialists were becoming more brutal, and at last the prohibition to hold meetings was proclaimed. Every organisation got its own prohibition notice. The Communist Party of Indonesia received it first and afterwards, the Sarekat Rayat, a revolutionary nationalist party which was directly under the leadership of the Communists. Further, all Red workers' organisations were doomed to illegality. Up to the end of September 1925, all political and workers' organisations with Communist leaders were closed down.

It was decided to hold the Youth conference in Solo in the middle of October. Not only all delegations of the youth were present, but also the members of the Central Committee of the C. P. I. and those of the Red Trade Unions.

The whole police force of the province Solo was mobilised, but nevertheless the leaders of the C. P. and of the various Red Trade Unions succeeded in reaching the temple of Prambanan, where a secret conference was held, known as the Pram-

banan Conference. This gathering was participated in by all members of the Central Committee of the C. P. I. and leaders of the railway workers, seamen and dockers, metal workers, postal workers and other revolutionary organisations. It was decided to prepare a general attack upon the Dutch imperialists and the railway workers should start the action by proclaiming a general strike. This strike would be considered as the signal for the commencement of the insurrection.

Comrades, due to the fact that the leaders were young and lacking the necessary theory and guidance from abroad, we knew very little of the international political situation, and which slogan should be put forward. We did not know how to set up a clear national programme which would attract all classes of the population to join in the insurrection. Therefore it was decided to postpone the campaign to July 1926 in order to give the delegation sufficient time to go to Moscow and to make all necessary preparations.

Meanwhile the reaction was growing all the more sinister, especially at Surabaya, the capital of Eastern Java and the centre of commerce and industry. All workers were ready to go on strike. The metal workers had already submitted 22 demands to their bosses demanding an answer within a week. With many difficulties the strike was delayed because the Prambanan conference had decided that we had to wait until July next year. But the capitalists considered the delay of the strike as a weakness of the workers, and they became more brutal and more provocative.

On December 13th, the strike of the workers of the metallurgical concern, the "Industry", broke out. The next day, December 14, all important metallurgical concerns came to a standstill. A week later the dockers declared their solidarity with the metal workers and they transmitted 19 demands to their employers.

Comrades, it sounds incredible, but it is nevertheless true that the whole police power of Surabaya was standing behind the strikers. The passive resistance of the Intelligence Department showed that the strike was growing rapidly. Not only the police, but also the government officials were distrusted by the government. The whole police force, from the lowest policeman up to the highest Dutch police officers, were replaced by police from Batavia. The resident of Surabaya protested against this action of the Government stating that the strike had an economic basis. The Resident was discharged from his high post. Meanwhile the suppression of the strike began, premises of the workers' organisations and houses of Communists were raided. A mass arrest was carried out and the strikers were driven back to work at the point of bayonets. Comrades, the strike of the metal workers of Surabaya was undoubtedly one of the most peculiar and important strikes in Indonesia.

After the Surabaya strike all Communist activities could only be conducted illegally. Persecution and arrests took place in the most barbaric manner.

At the beginning of 1926 many leaders of the C. P. and leaders of workers' organisations who could escape from the clutches of Dutch spies fled abroad and there a second conference was held. A delegation went to Moscow and the other leaders went back to Java to go on with the preparations. In the meantime, a third conference took place in which also participated several leaders from Java and Sumatra, and the chairman of the C. C., C. P. I. The conference decided that preparations be stopped and the general attack delayed. Comrades, it is clear that this last Conference was causing a split among the leadership of the uprising. While persecution was still terribly raging the split aggravated the unrest of the workers and peasants who were anxiously awaiting the beginning of the insurrection.

The Conference was disastrous and when the uprising in Batavia on November 13, 1926, started it was chiefly carried out by workers, but without declaring a strike because the trade union leaders were bound by the last conference decision. At the outbreak of the uprising all experienced leaders were either arrested or banished. Connections between various sections were totally broken by the authorities. Therefore, a month later after the Batavia uprising, the insurrection of the peasantry broke out at Bantum, and several weeks later at Sumatra. This carrying out of the general attack in different stages was caused chiefly by the lack of communication on the

one hand and by the split on the other. This gave the Dutch imperialists the possibility to suppress the insurgents one by one very easily.

Comrades, the influence of the C. P. of Indonesia before the uprising was very great, not only among the working class and the peasantry, but also among the government officials, the police and the army. This was also confirmed by the so-called Bantam report which speaks of the Communist insurrection in Bantam (Western Java) In the report it is admitted that in many places the C. P. I. had more authority among the population than the government. The insurrection would have had more effect throughout Indonesia if there would not have been the split among the leadership.

Before the insurrection in 1926 when the Communists had the hegemony over the peasantry and the working class, the influence of the Social Democracy extended merely to the well-paid Dutch workers, most of whom are employed in government service and never enjoyed the sympathy of the colonial proletariat. It is known to everybody that these Socialists are willing servants of the capitalists, also in Indonesia.

In 1925 when the Government introduced the regime of economy a mass dismissal of the workers took place and also a great number of Dutch employees were discharged; Van Brakel, the leader of the European postal workers, stated that it is the duty of every loyal worker to support the measures of the government, the aim of which is to overcome the financial crisis and therefore, the Union of Postal Officials could do nothing against the regime of economy.

Van Brackel also requested the authorities to proclaim the meeting prohibition law against the Native Postal Union, of which I was the leader.

During the uprising when the Social Democrats realised that the workers would not be victorious Stokvis stated in a public meeting that it was the serious task of every worker to back the government by breaking the Communist influence among the workers, because the Communists were intending to overthrow the authorities and to disturb the peace of society.

Shortly after the uprising proposals were made from many reactionary quarters to purge the government's apparatus from all officials who had socialist tendencies. Not only the Communists, but also the Social Democrats were marked as those who were considered as being dangerous. Real consternation reigned among the Social Democrats, because most of them were working as government officials. In order to prevent their dismissal the Executive of the Social Democratic Party made an application to the government, in which they say that the exclusion of Social Democrats from the Government apparatus is based on a wrong idea as to the conception of Social Democracy, etc., etc.

In December 1927, the People's Council discussed the abolishment of the Exorbitant Rechten (The special rights given to the Governor-General to banish everyone who is suspected of being a dangerous element).

On the basis of this Exorbitant Rechten after the uprising there were more than 2000 revolutionary workers exiled to the malaria smitten district of Boven Digul amidst the jungle in New Guinea. Middendorp, a leader of the Indonesian Social Democracy and a member of the Volksraad declared earnestly that for the time being the Exorbitante Rechten were very necessary. This was not only because he wished to deceive more easily the workers, but also because he knew there was in Indonesia still a great number of revolutionary workers although living in illegality.

A certain Noteboom, the leader of the "Sporband" (Railway workers' Union) and a member of the Social Democracy has lately been trying in every way to gain influence among the native railroad workers. During 1927 he succeeded in attracting a group of railway workers at Bandung to the native railwaymen's union newly formed by him. On October 25, 1927, the members of the C. C. of this Union assured the Chief Inspector of the government railway company that their union would engage only in economic questions and that it had nothing whatever to do with the political movement. Chief Inspector Stargaard expressed himself fully satisfied and he hoped that the new union of the native railroad workers would in future be able to work in contact with the authorities.

In the last time, when the Nationalists were getting more and more sympathy among the workers and peasants, the

Social Democrats were also busy arranging meetings in which they express their sympathy with the national liberation movement and speak of the possibility of co-operation between Social Democracy and the Indonesian nationalists. Stokvis, in a public meeting on March 1928, stated that the present policy of the Government, i. e. the suppression of the Communists, is correct. The Indonesian workers must not be influenced by destructive doctrines, but they must be told to live in peace with the employers.

The suppression of the Communist Party gave a broad scope for revival to the national movement in the middle of 1927. Directly after the uprising the National Party of Indonesia was established by Indonesian intellectuals. The new party is pursuing the policy of rejecting any co-operation with the Dutch Government granted a kind of concession to the is the boycott of councils created by the government, like the Municipal Councils, the Provincial Councils and the People's Councils.

In order to win over the sympathy of the nationalists and to hamper the revolutionary development of the nationalists, the Dutch Government granted a kind of concession to the nationalists, i. e. to increase the number of the native members of the Volksraad, so that the natives would form the majority in that council.

In the so-called Indonesian Council, the advisory body of the Governor General, there would also be appointed a native member. In spite of this concession the revolutionary nationalists still reject the participation in the said Councils.

Notwithstanding the fact that this national movement exists already for nearly two years, and in spite of its clear programme which demands the complete liberation of Indonesia from Holland's domination, this National Party is not yet enjoying the sympathy of the masses. This is due to the fact that the leaders are not able to fulfil the will of the masses, i. e. their economic demands. Apart from this the influence of the Communist Party up to now is still predominant among the masses.

TO OUR READERS!

The monthly subscription rates for the "Inprecorr" are as follows:

England	2 sh.
America	50 cents
Germany	1.50 marks
Austria	2 schillings
Norway	1.50 crowns
Sweden	1.50 crowns
Denmark	1.50 crowns
U. S. S. A.	1 rouble

For all other countries the subscription rate is 3 dollars for six months.

Readers in the United States will please note that the sole agents for the "Inprecorr" in the U. S. A. are the Workers Library Publishers, 39 East 125th Street, New York, N. Y., to whom all subscriptions should be sent.

The Business Manager.